

Class

270.20

Book

B76
v2 c-4

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

EX LIBRIS

Leicester Crosby Lewis, S.T.D.

G. T. S. 1912

VICAR OF ST. LUKE'S CHAPEL

TRINITY PARISH, NEW YORK

1945-1949

Recente G. Kewer.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

VOL. II.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT
FATHERS : ST. ATHANASIUS, ST. CHRYSOSTOM, and
ST. AUGUSTINE. With Appendices. Crown 8vo. 6s.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH :
AND OTHER STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. Crown 8vo.
7s. 6d.

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

MORALITY IN DOCTRINE. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. Fcp. 8vo. 5s.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

THE
AGE OF THE FATHERS

BEING
CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH
DURING THE
FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES

BY THE LATE
WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. II.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1903

All rights reserved

270.20

B76

v.2 c.4

114065

NEW YORK
LIBRARY
SECRET 114065

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXVII. THE WESTERN CHURCH AT THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY	1
XXVIII. ST. CHRYSOSTOM BEFORE HIS TROUBLES	27
XXIX. ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S EARLIER TROUBLES	48
XXX. ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S LATER TROUBLES	76
XXXI. WESTERN AFFAIRS TO THE TAKING OF ROME	107
XXXII. THE DECLINE OF DONATISM	140
XXXIII. THE RISE OF PELAGIANISM	159
XXXIV. THE DECLINE OF PELAGIANISM	199
XXXV. BETWEEN TWO CONTROVERSIES	236
XXXVI. THE RISE OF NESTORIANISM	254
XXXVII. THE COUNCILS OF ROME AND ALEXANDRIA	285
XXXVIII. THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS—PART I.	308
XXXIX. THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS—PART II.	334
XL. THE REUNION OF CYRIL AND THE ORIENTALS	353
XLI. THE END OF THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY	386
XLII. WESTERN AND EASTERN AFFAIRS TO A.D. 445	395
XLIII. THE RISE OF EUTYCHIANISM	427
XLIV. THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN A.D. 448	445
XLV. THE PREPARATIONS FOR A NEW GENERAL COUNCIL	466
XLVI. THE "LATROCINIUM"	479
XLVII. THE INTERVAL BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON	494
XLVIII. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON—PART I.	515
XLIX. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON—PART II.	533
INDEX	551

THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE WESTERN CHURCH AT THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

THE 17th of January, 395, the day on which Theodosius the Great expired at Milan, must have been long remembered by thoughtful and observant minds throughout the Roman empire, as the close of a period which on the whole had been fruitful in public peace, prosperity, and glory. It is indeed easy to imagine the feelings with which such minds must have received the evil tidings of the great Emperor's departure. It was not only the passing away of a "strong man" and a noble and princely spirit—noble and princely, in spite of too frequent bursts of passion, or increasing indolence, or the taste for the luxury and extravagance of a court—from the highest place of earthly dignity; it was virtually the passing away, with him, of the empire's unity, solidity, and true greatness; it was the awakening of the gravest anxieties wherever there was capacity to appreciate a public crisis, to estimate approaching perils, and to discern the signs of a realm's weakness or decay. He was gone, who had upheld the State for sixteen years from the time when Gratian selected him, the exiled son of a disgraced and condemned father, to govern the East and terminate a dangerous war; and he had left the sovereignty divided between his two sons, aged eighteen and eleven—Arcadius to reign at Constantinople, and Honorius to preside over the West.

Courtly lips might officially salute in these boys the undoubted heirs of their father's merits, as well as of his dignity: even Ambrose

might profess, in a solemn discourse forty days after the death of Theodosius, that he recognised the parent in the sons, or at least that it was a "duty" to do so; and he, and other good men with him, might hope that something, at least, of their late sovereign's kindness of heart and religious earnestness might be reproduced in princes who, if they had been occasionally frightened by his moods of passion, could hardly forget that they had responsibilities as the children of an illustrious father, and who had been entrusted by him to the tuition of the saintlike Arsenius. Yet they had profited little by that advantage. The story that the elder of them, having been corrected with a ferule, carried his boyish spite so far as to plot against his tutor's life, is likely enough to be an invention; but it is certain that Arsenius found his efforts for their benefit defeated by their own incapacity, as well as by the noxious influences of a court. Both, in short, were hopeless subjects for so awful a charge as the care of an empire; both illustrated the strange irony of events that often burdens incompetent natures with functions that might overtax the strong. Both princes were destined, as Gibbon says in a famous allusive passage about the French and Spanish Bourbons, to "slumber on thrones" which needed signal energy in their occupants.

It was for both a pathetic "misfit." But the younger, "born in the purple," was the more "vacuous" of the two; and his torpidity of mind at a crisis so stormy and perilous for the West was nothing less than tragical. He had been specially entrusted to the care of the great Vandal Stilicho, who had married Serena, the cousin of the young Emperors, and who united several conspicuous excellences—if not all the perfections ascribed to him by the poet Claudian—with pre-eminent military renown and the opportunities of a commanding position, opportunities which some may think he was tempted to misuse for ends of his own. He was to serve as a "shield" to both the brothers, but, as stationed in the West, he had of course a peculiar duty towards its sovereign: and the interests of the Eastern and Western courts were so far from identical, that Dr. Hodgkin compares the empire to "a house divided against itself."

It was the misfortune of the "witless young man" who reigned at Constantinople—"short, thin, sallow," seldom speaking, always looking as if he were half asleep—to fall practically into the hands of a very different minister, of one who had been like an evil genius to his father, and who, in the furious

invective of Stilicho's partisan poet, appears so wholly black that we instinctively find ourselves looking for traces of better qualities suppressed by his unscrupulous animosity. Yet if Rufinus was not quite "the demon of the piece," he appears to have been, as Professor Bury puts it, "sufficiently unprincipled," regardless of justice and humanity, insatiably avaricious, and more than suspected of aspiring to actual sovereignty. His stately and imposing person might well seem more prince-like than the insignificant figure which seemed, by its apathetic dulness, to contradict the idea suggested by the purple robe and jewelled diadem and gilded chariot—except for these splendid appendages, a sort of Merovingian parody of royalty, contrasting with a magnificent Mayor of the Palace. Rufinus was indeed defeated in his attempt to secure the Emperor's hand for his daughter; but he afterwards flew at higher game still. He seems, in fact, to have fallen into the infatuation which "insolent strength," as the old Greeks said, was apt to produce. Alaric threatened Constantinople; Stilicho, at the head of his forces, but after delays which have been unfavourably interpreted, advanced along the eastern side of the Hadriatic to the rescue of one of his imperial wards; he was suddenly stopped by an order, signed by the hand of Arcadius, to keep the main body of his host outside the Eastern realm, and to send on his Eastern troops only for the preservation of the Eastern capital. He obeyed in both particulars; but Rufinus had not reflected on the resentment which such an affront to their general would excite in soldiers thus called to his master's aid. They arrived, under the leadership of a Goth named Gainas, in a dangerous mood; yet Rufinus would not perceive the danger. He organized a grand review at a suburb of Constantinople, and is said to have prepared Arcadius to deliver a speech announcing his association in the sovereignty; but before it could be delivered, a soldier sprang forward, and stabbed the intended co-Emperor to the heart, with the significant exclamation, "It is Stilicho that strikes thee!" Was it so, indeed? Most probably Stilicho had given no such orders: but he could not be ignorant of the natural working of his soldiers' minds, and he could not be expected to deplore the removal of a rival whom he naturally abhorred. The exultation with which Claudian describes the brutal mangling of the corpse makes one glad that he was not a Christian.

The new reign in the East was inaugurated by new laws against heretics, who were forbidden to hold meetings even in private, or

to organize any ministry, and were disqualified from filling any post under the government. As for the internal strength of the Church, so far as it resided in her more distinguished bishops, her members could still look up to Ambrose at Milan as the representative prelate of the time; to Siricius at Rome; to the energetic, though far from saintly, Alexandrian Theophilus; to the venerated Flavian, who now, at Antioch, held the episcopate without any one to dispute his claim, but was not yet recognised by Rome or the West in general. Gregory of Nyssa was perhaps alive, but his career as a public man was ended. John of Jerusalem was in full vigour, and a few years had passed since the quarrel between him and Epiphanius, who, old as he was, retained, and was destined again to display, his controversial vehemence and obstinacy. Martin was still at work in Gaul, although he seems to have been approaching his eightieth year. Valerius of Hippo Regius, and Aurelius of Carthage, were among the most eminent prelates of the Church in Africa: among those of Italy, beside Siricius and Ambrose, Gaudentius of Brescia, famous as a preacher, deserves notice. The two most gifted presbyters of Christendom were undoubtedly Jerome and Augustine; but Italy was just welcoming or wondering at the arrival from Spain of the newly ordained Paulinus, who, some three years before, had been one of the most brilliant and admired members of the Roman nobility in southern Gaul, and had now resolved to settle at Nola in Campania, where his devotion to the local saint Felix was to give an injurious impetus to a growing perversion of Christian piety. There was no great danger to be expected from Christians in separation from the Church: the sects were weakened by penal laws, and distracted by internal quarrels; especially were the Donatists of Africa divided among themselves by the feud between the Primianists and the Maximianists, the former of whom were preparing, by aid of the civil power at Carthage, to persecute the latter. In this feud, as the Catholics were never weary of observing, might be seen a reproduction of the old and long-continued strife between the whole Donatist body and the Church; for as the original Donatists had broken with the Church, the Maximianists broke, in like manner, with the Donatists who adhered to Primian.

It is to Africa that we must look for the first event of ecclesiastical importance after the accession of Honorius to Western sovereignty. Our scene is laid at Hippo Regius, or King's Harbour, "a maritime colony," as Gibbon describes it, "some two hundred

miles west of Carthage ;" formerly a seat of Numidian kings, and now boasting the title of a Roman city. Its remains, which include the ruins of an aqueduct and of some massively built halls, have been found on an olive-crowned hill to the west of Bona, which represents its ancient port. It had been an episcopal city from the days of St. Cyprian, under whose presidency its bishop, Theogenes, had sat in a council of Carthage in 256, and had joined in the synodical declaration against the validity of heretical baptism. Its Christian inhabitants were excitable, irritable, and easily depressed, but kind-hearted and often generous in almsgiving ; sometimes unfortunately impressible when false teachers appeared in their midst, sometimes too ready to adopt survivals of ancient pagan observance. Here, as in many African towns, Donatism was not only a rival of the Church, but surpassed her in numerical force ; but the Donatist bishop, Proculeianus, was much respected as a courteous gentleman, and Hippo was at least spared the scandal of such a sectarian chief pastor as too often disgraced the Donatist name. To Hippo Augustine had come, four years before the death of Theodosius, at the invitation of a resident, one of the imperial "agents" or messengers, who wished to consult him on spiritual matters. No one could have foreseen that so apparently incidental a visit was the inauguration of so great a life-work, the opening of such an "effectual door." Once at Hippo, he was constrained to receive the priesthood ; and Valerius, the old bishop, set him to work as a preacher—an employment of a presbyter contrary to African usage, though frequent enough in the East. His own estimate of the ministry at this time is well worth remembering. "Nothing easier or pleasanter, from a human point of view, in God's sight nothing more wretched and damnable, than a perfunctory discharge of the office of bishop, presbyter, or deacon ; nothing, especially now, more difficult and perilous, but in God's sight nothing more blessed, than such a discharge of it as our divine Commander enjoins." Augustine's sermons became famous ; and thus, when the Council of Hippo met in 393, he was desired to address the episcopal assembly in the basilica of Peace, and delivered an exposition of the creed. Other work came into his hands : he held a discussion with a Manichean named Fortunatus, who was silenced, but remained unconvinced ; a very interesting treatise followed on the "Utility of Believing," as against the Manichean disparagement of faith, a quality which Augustine takes care to distinguish from credulity, and to commend in its moral

bearings; another, on "Falsehood," enforced the supreme obligation of veracity, as against the dissimulation prevalent among the Priscillianists. But the most urgent of questions at that time was the twofold debate—partly on a matter of fact, partly on a broad issue of principle—forced on the Church by her Donatist adversaries; and Augustine's first contribution to it was the very curious "Psalm," or ballad, addressed to "all who rejoice in peace" and are now called upon to "judge truly," in which he strove to popularise the Catholic line of argument, and to provide the average layman with a defence, both as to questions of fact and of principle, against the persistent assumptions and misrepresentations of sectarianism. And while thus employed, he was living in a house with a garden, close to the Cathedral of Hippo, as the head of a religious community, which in time supplied some ten churches with bishops from among its members and disseminated the spirit of monastic devotion throughout the African Church.

In the spring of this year 395 he made a regular onslaught on an abuse which he had lamented three years earlier in a letter to the bishop of Carthage, and to which he had made a pointed allusion in a sermon preached during the preceding winter—the unseemly revelries held within churches on saints' days, and popularly, and, as Augustine intimates, euphemistically, known as "*Lætitiæ*." These were feastings which too closely resembled those that were customary in days of paganism, and which the African Church authorities had thought it best to tolerate, with a transfer of associations which might, it was hoped, in some sort neutralise their evil; although in almost all transmarine churches they had been suppressed. Augustine's own saintly mother had been accustomed, until better instructed at Milan, to bring a basket of cakes and a cup of wine to churches, and eat and drink in memory of the Saints—to join, in fact, in a form of the old *Agapæ*. Her son's spirit was stirred by indignant grief when he saw, time after time, "the whole space of a large basilica" filled by groups of Church-people, not even content with such a moderate repast, but indulging themselves to excess and intoxication. He remonstrated, first on a Wednesday, by way of comment on the text "Give not that which is holy to the dogs;" then, on a solemn day when a fuller congregation assembled at sermon-time, he applied to the same purpose other portions both of the Old and New Testament, and made a moving appeal to them "by Christ's humiliation, by the blows and spitting, by the thorny

crown, the Cross, the Blood," and by their love for their old bishop who had set him to preach the word of truth to them, with a solemn warning of divine punishment if they disregarded what he had read. This was probably one of the earliest occasions on which the people of Hippo became really aware of his moral energy and his ability as a preacher: they wept, and this token of a better mind drew tears from Augustine; he hoped that he had brought them round. The next day, May 4, was the feast of St. Leontius, a former bishop of Hippo, when one of these "Rejoicings" would ordinarily be held. At daybreak he learned that some persons were discontentedly asking "why an old usage was now prohibited; whether it could be said that those who formerly sanctioned the rejoicings were not Christians?" Augustine was prepared, if necessary, to read out in church the words of Ezekiel about the watchman who fulfils his duty by giving warning, and then, if they were still obstinate, to "shake his garments" and depart. But before service-time the objectors gave him the opportunity of privately and gently urging on them his view of the case, and he thus soon brought them to a better mind. He then went into church, and told the people briefly that what had with good intention been tolerated among new converts was not to be tolerated among their fully Christianized posterity. "There was a reason for conceding it at the time, and for the time; that reason, the expediency of being indulgent to weakness, cannot be pleaded now. Look," he proceeded, "to foreign churches: the custom either never prevailed abroad, or, where it did, good prelates and an obedient people have concurred in uprooting it. If the basilica of St. Peter at Rome be cited as a scene of such revels, I answer—I have heard that they have often been forbidden there: besides, the bishop of Rome lives at a distance from that basilica" (*i.e.* at the Lateran, on the opposite side of the city), "and it is difficult, or impossible, entirely to restrain the unruliness of all the nominal Christians who inhabit or visit so great a city. But I would have you think less of Peter's church, and more of Peter's Epistle;" and then, taking up a copy of it, he read 1 Pet. iv. 1-3. He saw the effect already produced, and at once added, "Come hither at noon, for Scripture readings and psalmody." Immediately after midday the church was filled. Before bishop Valerius and the clergy entered, lessons and psalms were recited alternately by the congregation; when they entered, two psalms followed, and Valerius compelled Augustine to make another address. Although

he had hoped that the day's task was over, he complied. Then the evening service, which, says he, "is wont to be said daily," was duly performed; the bishop and priests retired, but "the brethren" sang a hymn in church, and a number of worshippers, men and women, remained there, singing psalms, until sunset.

So ended these anxious days. It is worth¹ while to have seen in some detail how Augustine risked his popularity, and strained his influence, in the cause of Christian strictness and reverence; how decisively he contended that an indulgence, or, as it might be called, an economy—such as Gregory of Neocæsarea had thought expedient for proselytes from heathenism, such as his own namesake of Canterbury was advised long afterwards by a greater Gregory to practise in the English mission-field—must, as both those Gregories intimated, be regarded as essentially temporary, and be cancelled when a population was fairly won to the faith. When we hear the fathers broadly accused of allowing their people's Christianity to be paganised, by way of bribing them into Christian good behaviour, we shall do well to think of the "Lætitiae" of Hippo and the greatest father of the Latin-speaking Church.

Such a man could not be allowed to remain a simple presbyter. The aged Valerius, who regarded him as a special gift to his old age, was afraid that some other church would demand him as its bishop. He had once, indeed, under this apprehension—which in that case was well founded—caused Augustine to go actually into hiding. He hoped to secure him as his own successor; but he presently conceived the notion of obtaining his help at once as coadjutor. The bishop of Carthage was applied to, and wrote a favourable reply; he had for some time been on terms of affectionate intimacy with Augustine. Valerius then invited his own Numidian "primate," Megalius, to come to Hippo, when the projected consecration was solemnly resolved upon in a large assembly of bishops, clergy, and people. Megalius, who perhaps was in his dotage, at first objected on the ground of a calumnious story, equally odious and ludicrous, which some enemy of Augustine had set on foot. The other prelates demanded proof of it; Megalius then asked pardon, and made no further difficulty. But Augustine himself scrupled about being made bishop while the actual bishop of the see was living. "It is against Church usage." "No," he was answered, "it is common enough, both in Africa and abroad." Thus overborne, Augustine yielded, and was consecrated shortly before the Christmas of 395. It was afterwards that he learned how his scruples were

in accordance with the strict letter of the eighth Nicene canon, which appeared to be distinct against the co-existence of "two bishops in one city;" but, in fact, this rule—expressed in St. Cyprian's days by the formula, "One bishop in a Catholic church" (*i.e.* in each single diocese belonging to the Catholic unity), and on a memorable occasion after the Nicene Council clamorously proclaimed by the Roman Church-people with the cry of "one God, one Christ, one bishop,"—was never, as a matter of history, taken to exclude the case now to be provided for at Hippo. Augustine was not, while Valerius lived, to be bishop *of* Hippo, but to be for Valerius only what Alexander had been for Narcissus at Jerusalem, Anatolius for Theotecnus of Cæsarea, and, to come nearer to his own time and his own church, what Senecio had become for a bishop named Bassus, under the sanction of the Council of Capua. Yet as late as 426 he regarded the arrangement as irregular, and said that he would not have it repeated in regard to his intended successor Heraclius.

Thus began Augustine's episcopate, or, as he habitually regarded it, his bearing of "the burden," which he did not lay down, as it proved, until the great surge of Vandal invasion swept in its desolating fury over his national Church. But thirty-five years of toil and glory lay between the day when the Gospel-book was held over his shoulders as he knelt before Megalios, and that sad August when, as he fixed his dying eyes on sheets inscribed with the penitential psalms, his last moments were disturbed by tidings of general terror and daily-expected ruin. Yet, could he have foreseen, in 395, all the stress and harass of ceaseless controversies, the series of inevitable wearisome anxieties, and, at the close of all, the fatal siege of Hippo in 430, he would doubtless have gone to his work with as brave a spirit, with as manful a loyalty to the "sweet will of God," as when, content to be led on still by the Hand that had already brought him to his soul's true home out of many wanderings, he betook himself to episcopal duties and laid out his plan of episcopal life. He was forty-one years old: his health was not good, but he carefully excluded everything like luxury from his personal habits; his table, says Possidius, his biographer, was frugal; he mostly lived on vegetables, but had meat served for guests or in case of sickness—and there was always wine. Possidius tells us that his spoons were silver, but the other furniture of his table was of wood, or earthenware, or marble. He never allowed any unkindly gossip or "detraction;"

and on the table itself were engraved two verses of warning on this point. No woman, not even his own widowed sister, who lived many years as superior of a body of devoted women, was permitted to make any stay under his roof. As he had formed a "monastery" in the house where he dwelt before his consecration, so he now instituted in his episcopal abode a community of clerics, as the nearest approach to monastic life which was consistent with the episcopal duty of hospitality. All his clerics lived in common after the pattern of the earliest Christians at Jerusalem; "no one was allowed to have anything of his own." He himself, as he expresses it, had "despised his little paternal estate." "If," he once said, "any *do* keep something of their own, they break the rule." With characteristic generosity he forbore to inquire into this matter: "I have a good opinion of my brethren; I know that all who live with me know our principle and the law of our life." All swearing was forbidden; an oath was punished by forfeiture of one of the draughts of wine which were allowed by the rule of the house to every inmate. "All breaches of discipline," we are told, "he used to reprove, and bore with them as long as was right;" and he was specially emphatic against false excuses, and against neglect of the divine precept in Matt. v. 24. His occupations were such as never to leave him, in his own phrase, more than "a few drops of leisure;" he must often have remembered how, when he was at Milan, Ambrose had but little spare time and could seldom sit long over his studies. For one thing, when he became actual bishop of Hippo after Valerius's death, the administration of the estates of his church—twenty times larger than his own inherited property—was very onerous to him; he would gladly have been quit of it, if duty had allowed; and his sensitiveness as to any possible scandal, such as had arisen amid the Roman clergy in the reign of Valentinian I., made him very careful as to receiving bequests for the Church. Sometimes he absolutely refused bequests of land, made in prejudice of the natural heirs of the testator: "it would not be just or fair to take for the Church what should go to the family." He preferred legacies to bequests of a whole inheritance, and was earnest against anything like urgency for such legacies. He never would buy any property; and, withal, he was "forward" to supply the wants of the poor, as far as the means at hand would reach, and induced his people every winter to provide them with clothing.

It was then regarded as one of a bishop's functions to

represent the merciful spirit of Christianity by interceding with magistrates on behalf of criminals. Ambrose "often" did so, although he forbade all disorderliness or insolence in the use of this privilege; and Martin, as is well known, interfered in the case of the Priscillianists: but, says Bingham, "we are not to imagine that bishops turned patrons for criminals to the obstruction of public justice;" they only pleaded against extreme penalties when the case had extenuating circumstances, or when mercy would clearly tend to public good or to the salvation of the offender's soul. But although ecclesiastics might not be the best judges of such "circumstances," or of the bearing of a case on the interests of society, our opinion as to the practice must not be irrespective of the extreme severity and cruelty which Roman hard-heartedness had long associated with the administration of Roman law: time had not yet been given for the leaven of the gospel to work a change of any great magnitude in this respect. Thus the privilege of Intercession, like that of "Asylum," however out of place and prolific in abuses under any well-ordered state such as modern civilisation has produced, was often a healthy corrective of the haste and pitilessness of so-called justice; it gave time for reflection, and probably saved many an innocent life. Sometimes, indeed, the people were more urgent that the bishop should intercede for a sufferer, even at any sacrifice of his regular duties, than befitted Christian men; and Augustine would plainly tell them so. When he consented to intercede, he did it with such dignity and modesty that although occasionally he, like other prelates, was subjected to much humiliation, kept waiting at the magistrate's door, or even dismissed with a rebuff, yet generally he commanded the admiring respect of those to whom he appealed.

Another weighty business was the arbitration between Christians who were at variance, and who, by bringing the case before their bishop, considered themselves to be following the advice of St. Paul (1 Cor. vi. 5). Augustine quite agreed with them on this point: he also knew that such episcopal decisions were respected by imperial laws, and he treated such cases, when submitted to him, with conscientious attention, sometimes listening during the whole day to the disputants without going to his usual meal. He made this work an opportunity for enforcing Christian principle—aiming throughout, says Possidius, at the promotion of Christian virtue. But he regarded the time thus spent as so much taken away, by a "compulsory service," from better things: his prayers, he wrote

in the early part of his episcopate, were "marred by the mist and noise of secular business, which hardly gave him time to breathe," and by the impatience of "turbulent" litigants who in the end "despised decisions" which disappointed them; and we find him in a Lenten sermon entreating to be allowed, at that sacred time, to act not as a judge between litigants, but as a reconciler to prevent litigation.

It was with all his soul that he threw himself, as bishop, into his own congenial work of preaching, not only at Hippo or in its district, but wherever he was invited, "being ready," says Possidius, "always to render to inquirers a reason concerning the faith and hope which is towards God." At Hippo he usually preached from his throne, and sometimes, says Bingham, used "the extempore way." Much as he evidently enjoyed this work, he was deeply conscious of its difficulty and of its responsibility; in the fourth book of his "Christian Doctrine" he gives rules for its performance. It was safer, he would say, to hear than to preach; "*He* knows with what shrinking I speak to you in His presence." He was frequently interrupted by applause which made him, as he said, tremble, and ask rather that they would strive to profit; he knew, too, that, especially on great festivals, some were present who did not really care for instruction. He took pains to make his teaching practical by varying its topics—sometimes expounding the lesson for the day; sometimes going off into the Donatist or other controversies; sometimes denouncing popular vices, as swearing, sensuality, or unworthy compromises with pagan usage, or actual retention of pagan superstition. This public teaching was accompanied by private dealing with sinners whose offences did not call for public censure; and beside these cases, there were days on which he was to be seen administering such "open penance" (formerly called *exhomologesis*) to a "long line" of really or apparently contrite offenders, and, where it was necessary—although he was "slow" to do it—his voice might be heard pronouncing excommunication against those who were past reproof. There were, moreover, catechumens to be instructed; and he describes with a gentle humour the interruption of study by the summons, "Come and speak to So-and-so, who wants to become a Christian." Then there were the sick to be visited and prayed for (with imposition of hands), the diocesan affairs to be managed, other bishops' work to be helped forward on occasion, literary work of his own to be pursued—one may

mention, as among his first books after his consecration, the "Christian Conflict"—and the stress and burden of the Donatist controversy. His arguments on that head were often referred by Donatists, for refutation, to their own prelates. Then followed rejoinders from him. Withal, he wrote letters to Donatist chiefs, but usually got no answer, save that he was angrily denounced as a deceiver of souls. On one occasion a Donatist presbyter, standing on a Catholic lady's ground, shouted after him, "Traditor, persecutor!" and some, fanatical to the point of ferocity, like many a gloomy zealot of their type, went so far as to say that it would be doing God service to kill him, as a wolf that was attacking the sheepfold. But there were exceptions to this: for Proculeianus of Hippo had the character of a "calm-minded" person, and although he would not correspond with Augustine, there seemed some chance of winning him over by means of an amicable debate; and Macrobius, his successor, showed at first some independence and fairness of mind, though he was soon drawn into the stream of Donatist partisanship.

Such were the employments and interests on which Augustine entered, in those first days or months of his episcopate: Valerius died, it would seem, in 396, and left him in sole possession. The account of his energy and success must have gladdened the great archbishop of Milan, who, on hearing of it, would recall the day when the ex-Manichean professor of rhetoric, after his many struggles and his wonderful conversion, had come to him for baptism about nine years back, and been received by him into Christian communion. Ambrose had been some twenty-two years on the throne of Milan; his life-work was drawing to a close; but we see all his old fire and determination in the attempt which, in 396, he made to protect a criminal named Cresconius, who took sanctuary from justice at an altar, but was dragged away by Stilicho's officers, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishop, in order to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatre of Milan: Stilicho exempted him from this horrible death, but visited his crimes by exile. The privilege of asylum has been already referred to as capable, indeed, of abuse even in days when it often served to procure a needful respite, but as not to be judged from a modern standpoint, and as respected, within limits, by the imperial authority. Another proceeding of Ambrose at this time was his correspondence with Fritigil, queen of the Marcomanni—a general name given to any of the tribes on the various marches or borders of Germany. She

had casually heard of his fame, and sent messengers to him with presents and a request for religious instruction. "He sent her," says his biographer Paulinus, "an excellent letter in the form of catechetical instruction in which he also exhorted her to persuade her husband to keep peace with the Romans." Thereupon she induced the king to place himself under the Roman power.

There is also a very interesting letter of Ambrose still extant, which he wrote in this year 396 to the church of Vercellæ. The see was vacant: great confusion prevailed, and the bishop of Milan was unfairly blamed for it, as if he could have imposed a bishop on one of his suffragan churches without a request from its clergy and people. What he could do was to remonstrate and exhort to unanimity. Let them agree in "choosing," or, as he also expresses it, in "requesting" or demanding, some one fit person for their bishop; the language is remarkable as fully recognising the legitimate action of the local church as well as of the provincial hierarchy. If clergy and laity express their mind with one consent in favour of any individual, that ought to be regarded as an indication of the will of Christ. Let them, therefore, make themselves willing to have His presence among them. And here Ambrose, with characteristic impetuosity on such a subject, proceeds to warn them against two men, Sarmation and Barbatian—evidently disciples of Jovinian—who had abandoned a monastic life at Milan, and had come to Vercellæ bent on attacking received opinions as to the special meritoriousness of religious celibacy and the spiritual value of prescribed fasts. He calls them Epicureans, pours out all his wrath upon them as adversaries of Christian strictness, and passionately infers that they encourage licentious freedom. Here we may discern a survival of Ambrose's old habits as an advocate; there is great disregard for balance in his statements. But he soon passes on to give the Vercellians excellent advice as to the temptations to factious bitterness, so constantly present to an Italian population. In so grave a business as an episcopal election there must be calmness, good temper, a "tranquil and peace-loving judgment;" the candidate himself must be gentle, matured in character, sympathetic, self-controlled; there must not be even the slightest spot on his reputation; he must be conspicuously consistent in conduct, according to the old maxim, "Accustom thyself to be *one*." Here, by the way, he explains the Pauline limitation, "husband of one wife," as excluding even those digamists whose first marriage had preceded their baptism; and, relying apparently

on a spurious addition in his copy of the Nicene canons, claims the Nicene canons also as disqualifying for the ministry any one who had ever married twice. After this, referring for a moment to his own reluctance, many years before, to accept the episcopate, he dwells on the glory of the Vercellian church as having possessed so admirable a bishop as Eusebius, who, being the first of Western prelates to combine monastic observance with episcopal activity, had thereby increased his moral influence, diminished laxity of conduct in his city, and gained strength to play the man as a confessor in the Arian persecution. This memorable letter or "charge," if not free from one-sidedness or overstatement, is rich in lessons of practical piety, of forgiveness of injuries, of prompt activity in good works, of ready sympathy with all suffering; it is emphatic against the pride of wealth and the lust of gain, against contentiousness, churlishness, indolence, cold-heartedness; it is comprehensive in its survey of the duties of Christians of every class—of husbands and wives, mothers, masters and servants; and it concludes thus worthily of the occasion and the writer: "To sum it up, turn all of you to the Lord Jesus (*ad summam, convertimini omnes ad Dominum Jesum*). Let your delight in this life be that of a good conscience; meet death patiently in the hope of immortality; be assured of resurrection by the grace of Christ; hold to truth with simplicity, faith with confidence, abstinence with sanctity, activity with sobriety, good conduct with modesty, learning without vanity, soberness of doctrine, true faith free from heretical fantasy. The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." The see of Vercellæ was committed to Honoratus, who had been a disciple of Eusebius, and a sharer in his sufferings.

And now when the year 397 began, and when he had held his see for rather more than twenty-two years, Ambrose found his strength failing. He was but fifty-six; but hard and varied work had told heavily upon him, and made him, like Basil and Chrysostom, old before his time. We must remember that he had been employed as a barrister, and then as the governor of a province, before his baptism and consecration; that, in his own phrase, he had been "whirled away from secular administration to episcopal duties." These duties were found to include not a little political business, and two laborious journeys across the Alps; but into the properly spiritual work of his office he threw himself with such energy, that he was said to have done more in regard to

postulants for baptism than five bishops of a younger generation could get through. He bestowed great pains on preaching, and advises a young prelate to speak to consciences, and put thought into his sermons, so as to produce a reasonable conviction. He was anxious, even to distress, about the appointment of good bishops, was moved to indignation by slackness in clerical conduct, and carried his watchful oversight into details, particularly urging one newly appointed prelate to prevent marriages of Christians with heathens. If a person besought his intercession with the court, he did his best to get a redress of grievances; if a church, like that of Pavia, had been deprived of a bequest by governmental interference, he was prompt to remonstrate against the wrong. Whether as bishop or metropolitan, he was assiduous and equitable in the administration of ecclesiastical justice, and would say that unfairness and partiality were never more offensive than in Church affairs. He kept up his studies, but was considerate in dispensing, except when he was unwell, with the services of a secretary; as a commentator on Scripture he was curiously overfanciful, and Jerome criticizes his work on the Holy Spirit as rather "pretty" than solid; but he did not lose touch with secular literature, and his letters exhibit Virgilian phrases, Aristotelian formulas, and borrowings from Cicero and from Philo. All who came near him must have felt that he was a genuine man, strictly truthful, honourable, consistent, and candid in admitting his own liability to error; as a citizen, keenly patriotic—he puts duty to "the country" even above duty to parents. Those who were admitted to his intimacy would find that he could be affectionately playful, as when he writes to a friend, "Your little grandson looks on me as his doctor." He was, like Chrysostom, open to manifold human interests; his book on the "Duties of Ministers" shows a knowledge of human nature in all its moods; when any one came to him for confession with a view to public penance, he "so wept as to draw out the penitent's tears," and Paulinus applies to him St. Paul's words in Rom. xii. 15. He dwells on the details of everyday duty, on the need of weighing words, and of avoiding alike an affected suavity and a brusque roughness; he rejects any distinction between the "honestum" and the "utile;" he condemns every form of deceit; he observes that over-indulgence will make men restive at the first censure. Men felt that he was at once strong and tender, that in him force of character and aptitude for rule went hand in hand with a discriminating sympathy. All this, combined

with ascetic habits—he took no forenoon meal except on holidays—had worn out his health before his time. That kingly, patient, and generous heart, with its glowing love for God and for man, had not, indeed, escaped detraction and harsh misconstruction; but around it had gathered many hearts, drawn to it by the attraction of its sweetness and nobleness, and repaying its kindnesses by enthusiastic loyalty. “I shall be with you,” said Ambrose to some such friends, “until next Easter.” He continued to work at his commentary on the Psalms. Like Columba, who in his own sphere was not less a born king of men’s hearts, he was occupied with the Psalter until his end came. He could not finish his exposition of that great record of a faithful Israelite’s experience under persecution, the forty-fourth psalm—in his reckoning the forty-third. But the closing words, “If the Lord stands over us and stands by us, we are able firmly to endure every contest,” were drawn out of the store of realised certainties which a life of struggles and trials had made his own.

Stilicho evidently believed that the prayers of Ambrose were irresistible; and sending for some Milanese churchmen of high rank, partly persuaded and partly coerced them into asking the bishop, after he was taken ill, to pray for a continuance of his own life. Ambrose heard the request, and made the world-famous answer, which Augustine heard of afterwards with such admiration: “I have not so lived among you as to be ashamed to live, nor yet do I fear to die, for we have a kind Lord.” He lay in bed at the end of a long gallery; and when four deacons at the other end were talking about his successor, and one of them said that Simplicianus (who had, perhaps, instructed him for baptism) might be chosen, they were all startled by hearing the well-known voice say, “An old man, but a good one!” He told a bishop who was praying beside him that he saw the Redeemer approaching him with a smile; and he lay with lips moving inaudibly, and hands extended in form of a cross, from 5 p.m. on Good Friday until after midnight. Then it was that bishop Honoratus, who had lain down to sleep in an upper part of the house, heard a voice thrice calling him, “Rise, make haste, he is just going!” and hurrying down, was just in time to give Ambrose his last communion with the reserved Sacrament,—as Paulinus says, to “impart to him the Lord’s Body, which he received, and then expired, carrying with him a good *viaticum*.” It was in the dim light of the early morning, Holy Saturday, the 4th of April, 397, that the “great church,”

which had been the scene of those memorable vigils in his second contest with the Arian court, opened its gates to receive his body. We can well imagine that those who attended the long Easter-eve service in that basilica would remember, for years afterwards, how they gazed in awe and grief on the dead face of their great bishop ; we can picture the Easter morning Celebration, in which the "Paschal joy" would make faith triumph over the sense of even such a bereavement ; we can follow in thought the vast procession—including even Jews and pagans—which afterwards attended the remains to their final resting-place beneath the altar of the Ambrosian basilica, where now the visitor, stooping down into a recess, may see the recently completed shrine. It is not well to think of him simply as distinguished, among the great ecclesiastics of that time, by his lofty enthusiasm for Church independence or Church authority, or even by the combination, in his mind and aims, of that fervent resolution to make the worldly power feel and respect the reality of the spiritual with an intense zeal for Christian righteousness—a combination, it must be admitted, which did not always prevent him from making untenable claims, disparaging the divine commission of the civil magistrate, or setting a precedent for later usurpations. We may call Ambrose, if we like, a "High Churchman ;" but he was, before all things else, a "high" Christian—a pastor of Christian souls, a preacher of Christian holiness, a loyal and devout worshipper of Christ. As with Athanasius and Chrysostom and Augustine and, we may well add, with Anselm, it was not an ecclesiastical cause, nor a theological interest, that was really sovereign with him ; he was what he was, and did what he did, in the strength of a deeper, more penetrating, more personal devotion, gathered up in the fulness of his own phrase, "*Omnia Christus est nobis.*"

We have seen that Simplicianus was approved of by the dying Ambrose as a fit successor to the see. This was enough to secure his election. He wrote to Augustine, whom he had known years before at Milan, and to whose conversion he had indirectly contributed : his letter was cordial and affectionate, and in it he asked Augustine's opinion on some difficulties in St. Paul and in the Old Testament history. The two books to Simplicianus, which Augustine wrote in reply, have a bearing on the history of theology, inasmuch as he was now led to reconsider a former opinion of his, identical with what was afterwards called Semi-Pelagianism, and to recognise the action of grace in the initial faith which accepted

Christianity, and which he had previously ascribed entirely to man's free-will. It was, he now held, from God that the power to believe was derived: he laid stress on the text, 1 Cor. iv. 7, as showing that the very first movements of the soul towards God are gifts received from Him. It must be admitted that, in laying this down, he not only asserted the momentous truth itself, but was carried on, through his logical severity and his desire to magnify Divine grace, into an assertion of the irresistible nature of its operation on the souls chosen, by an inscrutable decree of the Divine will, to receive this effectual calling, and to become vessels of this all-controlling mercy. Here then first emerges the Predestinarianism which in later days was to become so characteristic of this great writer's theology, and to invest it, as many must needs think, with an intensity, in reference to the question of Divine decrees, which was purchased by one-sidedness, and which certainly came into collision with some revealed aspects of the Divine character. This is not the occasion, however, for saying more upon the subject; enough to mark it, and pass on.

It is usual to place in the same year with the death of Ambrose the end of another great saint, whose work had been that of a wondrously successful missionary. Martin has indeed been thought by some to have survived until the year 400; but accepting the more common date, we may say that in the autumn of 397, being then about eighty-one, and, it might have been thought, far too old for such a journey, he travelled to Candes at the extremity of the diocese of Tours, in order to heal a strife among its clergy. The peacemaker's work would, he felt, be a fitting close of his long toils. He succeeded in his purpose, and meditated a return home, when he found himself too ill to move: fever had seized upon him. His clergy and other friends besought him to pray for recovery. His reply became not less famous than that of Ambrose, and is dwelt upon with rapturous admiration by Bernard: "Lord, if I am still necessary to Thy people, I refuse not to labour; Thy will be done." He kept up his devotional energy to the last. They wanted to place him on some poor bedding, instead of sackcloth and ashes. "A Christian, my sons," said Martin, "cannot fittingly die save on ashes. If I leave you any other example than this, I myself have sinned." They then asked that at least they might turn him on his side, as an easier posture than lying on his back. "No, let me, I pray, look towards heaven rather than earth, that I may see whither I am going." Then, after a startling outburst, implying

that he seemed to see the enemy of souls come to disturb his last moments, Martin passed away. The bystanders testified to Sulpicius that his corpse, just after death, was clear and radiant, as if it already partook in the glory of Resurrection. It was borne along the roads that led to his own city, with an immense train of mourners of all classes, including, it is said, about two thousand monks. That protracted funeral of the "Apostle" who, some sixty years before, had begun his course of faith and simple devotedness by giving half his cloak to the beggar at Amiens, reached its goal at his "great monastery" near Tours, where his grave was respected by enemies of Gaul, regarded by his countrymen as their central sanctuary, but finally rifled by Huguenot fanatics. Few names in Western Christendom have been through ages repeated with more reverence or more love.

It was between the deaths of Ambrose and of Martin that the heads of the African Church thought it time to hold another national Council. Four years had passed since the synod of Hippo, called by Possidius a plenary or general African Council, at which Augustine was present, not as a member, but as a presbyter commissioned to address the bishops on "Faith and the Creed." Accordingly, on the 28th of August, 397, the bishops deputed from the various African provinces assembled at Carthage in the basilica called *Restituta*, under the presidency of Aurelius. Already some bishops of the Byzacene province, headed by Muzonius, had come to Carthage and held a meeting on August 13, in which, with Aurelius's sanction, they drew up a "breviarium" or summary of the canons of Hippo. The full Council, when it met, approved this document, and renewed these canons, with some additions of its own. Among the matters dealt with are the annual synod, consecrations and ordinations, clerical duties, fasting communion, the mixed chalice, prayers used in church service. A list of canonical books is also given, including five of what we now reckon as "Apocrypha:" at the end of it the canon adds, "But let the church beyond sea be consulted about confirming this canon." By "canonical," the Council probably meant, in accordance with Augustine's use of the word, such books as the Church generally, or the chief churches, were wont to read in public worship. For Augustine used the term in a sense which he himself virtually admitted to be a lax one, as covering more books than were in the proper Jewish canon ratified by Christ.

He himself, as "bishop of the people of Hippo Regius," was

among the forty-four bishops who signed the proceedings of this Council of Carthage. At this time he had much work on hand, partly as an author—for he had begun his books “On Christian Doctrine”—and partly in resisting or attacking the Donatists. The rebellion of Gildo the Moor, whom Theodosius had unwisely entrusted with military command in Africa, and who stopped the supply of African corn for Rome in 397, brought to a head, as it were, the outrageous violence of a Donatist bishop, Optatus of Tamugada, who for years had been known as Gildo’s “satellite,” and was a bitter foe both to the Church and to the adherents of Maximian. His enormities were charged by the Catholics on his party; “or at any rate,” they said, “the Donatists (of the Primianist majority) communicate with him, and dare not disavow him.” Augustine, who repeatedly urges this point as telling directly against Donatist professions, was about this time engaged in discussions with Donatists of a very different temper. It is obvious that there must have been in so widespread a sect many men really earnest for what they deemed the cause of Christian discipline and Church sanctity—men who were prepossessed against the Catholics as lax in principle, and had imbibed an erroneous notion as to the facts of the original dispute. Some such persons Augustine found at a place called Tubursica—Glorius, Eleusius, and others—with whom he could even talk about reunion. They showed him a Donatist memoir or record of the old case of Felix and Cæcilian. This led him to set them right by a more trustworthy version of events; but he had no documents at hand, and therefore sent for some, probably from his own town, and a whole day was spent in going through the greater part of them—the records of the Council of Cirta and of the acquittal of Felix in the forenoon, and those of Cæcilian’s case in the afternoon. On returning home, Augustine wrote to Glorius and his friends a long letter, which is one of his statements of the Church’s case against Donatism, and in which, after a historical survey, he touches the principle at stake by denying that corruptions or sins in the Church body warrant secession from it, and confidently claims as “the great document” on his side what he calls, as in a later treatise, the *orbis terrarum*, the undivided Catholic Church.

Another time, he held a conference with Fortunius, the Donatist bishop of Tubursica, a moderate and candid man. Crowds gathered to hear the discussion—but very few of them seriously bent on truth, the great body being, as Augustine saw, much in the mood

of spectators in a theatre. They would not be silent ; their noisy talk nearly made debate impossible, and it was with difficulty that Augustine obtained leave from Fortunius to have notes of the conference taken by his own friends. Among the points of most interest are his offer to prove himself in communion with the churches named in Apostolic writings ; the appeal of Fortunius to the "Sardican Council" as having recognised a Donatus, with Augustine's inference that this Council, since it appeared to have condemned Athanasius, was really Arian—the fact being that it was the Arian Council of Philippopolis, passing itself off in its acts as Sardican, and now, as when he wrote against Cresconius the Donatist some nine years later, deceiving Augustine himself ; the strangely rash Donatist argument that those who were persecuted were thereby proved to be in the right ; and the pleasant exchange of courtesies between the disputants. Fortunius evidently did not like the Donatist custom of rebaptising Churchmen ; he referred to it as to a point settled, but spoke as if he regretted it ; and he said to Augustine, "You are the only one of your party who really desires to examine the question between us." "I promise you," said Augustine, "that I will find at least ten of ours who will meet the question in as kindly and religious a spirit as you have shown to-day." Next day he paid Augustine a visit ; but there was no time for further talk, for Augustine had to attend the consecration of a bishop at Cirta ; and Fortunius bade him a kindly farewell, with the understanding that a fuller and more regular conference should be arranged. Writing of this to Glorius and the others, Augustine suggests that the conference should be held in some quiet village, inhabited by Catholics and Donatists, but without a church ; that the Scriptures might be carried thither with the needful documents, and the debate be accompanied by earnest prayer on both sides. "We know not," says Tillemont, "what became of these efforts for peace to which our saint was prompted by charity." But it is well to remember the truly Christian tone exhibited on either side in these two conferences, which are worthy to be compared with one of the very best specimens of ancient controversy—the debate of Dionysius of Alexandria with the Millenarians of Arsinoe.

But the interest of a controversy between Christians would often be suspended in the presence, still manifest, of their common primeval foe. Paganism in the West, and especially African paganism, had been beaten down ; but its life was by no means

beaten out. The sweeping law of 392, which prohibited all idolatry whatever, even to the wreathing of a garland for the Penates, had not been, and could not as yet be, systematically carried out. Paganism had a hold still over a certain amount of social rank and cultivated intellect; it had its literary men, its poets, its historians; it could argue and criticize—could make polemical capital out of the dissensions or the vices of the Christians—could refine away, by glosses and subtle theories, the obvious grossness of the old image-worship; it could call the Gospel ethics incompatible with civil policy, propound objections to Christian doctrine or Scripture miracles, make clumsy jokes about uncouth names of martyrs, and be daintily supercilious at the notion of a “Crucified God.” It might be heard, in times of public distress, repeating its old formula of “Causa Christiani;” and might hope thus to touch the secret uneasiness of many a half-Christian in the “respectable classes,” and to get something for itself out of the moody savageness that might always be counted on in an irreligious mob. It could employ many less menacing agencies; its spell was yet potent on public amusements, and on such customs as those which long haunted the 1st of January; it could spread many a snare for Christian compliance, and raise fretting cases of conscience for Christian scrupulosity. For instance, a layman named Publicola asked Augustine—May a faithful man cut wood for house-purposes from a grove once dedicated to an idol, or drink of a well or fountain into which a libation has been poured? Or if he buys in the market meat which, after some doubts, he considers not to have been offered to idols, is he justified in eating it? Or if marauding barbarians swear by their strange gods to respect his land or spare his crop, is he free to accept immunity under such a profane sanction?

It was probably in part with a view to the difficulties caused in Africa by pagan pertinacity, and partly by way of indirect vengeance for the slaughter of three clerics, Sisinnius, Martyrius and Alexander, by the pagans of Anaunia, near Trent, in 397, that Honorius, or rather Stilicho acting in his name, took further steps in 399 against idolatry. The first of Honorius’s laws on this subject was dated at Ravenna, January 28, and was intended for Spain and Gaul. The Emperor forbids sacrifices, but orders the “ornaments of public works,” *i.e.* the statues belonging to public buildings, to be preserved, in spite of all previous orders for their removal. The second law, August 20, permits all festal assemblages

which caused "general pleasure," and were in accordance with old usage, provided they were kept clear of "sacrifice or any superstition." The third, which followed hard upon the second, ordered temples to be preserved, but idols to be removed by local authority, and any one found sacrificing to be punished with death. The guarded and limited amount of repression here employed towards the adjuncts of idolatry shows that Stilicho had to consider difficulties caused largely by what Professor Dill, in his volume on "*Roman Society*," calls "a dead weight of official resistance or negligence" on the part of "the provincial governor and his staff;" and shows, too, that he was desirous, from motives of policy, to repress such zeal as Martin had exhibited in Gaul, and as, in the March of this very year, was shown by two "Counts" who destroyed temples at Carthage. It was then, apparently, that the Christian population cried out, "As at Rome, so at Carthage!" and that the great temple of the goddess Cælestis, which had a pillared precinct nearly two miles in extent, but had been shut up and overgrown with bushes, was turned, at the Easter festival, into a church, in which the archbishop Aurelius placed his chair. But this, as Salvian of Marseilles shows, half a century later, in his book "*On the Government of God*," by no means proved her worship to be obsolete. And as on former occasions, outbreaks of idol-destroying violence were sometimes found to cost Christian blood: sixty Christians who had broken to pieces an image of Hercules at Suffecta were slain by the exasperated pagans, whom Augustine rebuked in an epistle equally indignant and sarcastic—offering to restore them "their god," all "carved, and chalked red," if they would "restore the lives they had torn away," and complaining that the man who was foremost in the massacre received signal honours in the "curia" of the city.

The close of the century found Augustine employed with special diligence in literary work. To this date or to this period of his life belong the very useful tract on "*Faith in Things Unseen*," the beautiful manual on "*Catechising the Simple*," the beginning of the great work "*On the Trinity*," the treatise "*Against Faustus the Manichean*," the two remarkable letters to Januarius on Church rites, the four books "*On the Agreement of the Evangelists*," the anti-Donatist treatise "*Against the Letter of Parmenian*," the work on Baptism, part of the work "*Against the Letter of Petilian*," and, above all, that most precious and lovable of all his works in the eyes of a Christian reader,—it is needless to name "the

Confessions." It is amazing to think of his energy as a writer, even if we give a large margin for the interpretation of the phrase of his Benedictine editors "about the year 400." And it must be added that he had much correspondence also on his hands, and doubtless his full share in the anxieties of the African episcopate.

It is in the last year of the century, in September of 400, that we find the Spanish episcopate again acting together, in the first of the memorable series of Councils of Toledo. This synod passed fifteen canons on discipline and ritual. One of them was aimed at the Priscillianist habit of coming into a Catholic church, taking the Eucharist into the hand, and not partaking of it. Another censures those who attend church without even professedly communicating. Restrictions on the married clergy were enforced; a person who had done penance for grave crimes was not to be made a cleric, save in case of urgency, when he might become an "ostiary" (porter) or a reader, but might not, even so, read the New Testament. Any such penitent already a deacon was to rank with sub-deacons. Other disabilities of a like kind were imposed on a sub-deacon who had married a second wife. Presbyters, deacons, or other ecclesiastics were to come to church "for the daily sacrifice." The old feeling about military service was expressed in a canon excluding from the diaconate any one who after baptism had "assumed the cloak or the belt." The prayers at lighting of lamps, called "Lucernarium," one of the two primitive daily offices, were only to be read in church, or, if in a country house, in presence at least of a deacon. No one who was under any sort of civil "obligation" was to be ordained without the consent of his patron. If a powerful man had pillaged a cleric or a poor man, and had contemned the bishop's summons to answer for it, all the bishops of the province were to be warned to hold him as excommunicate, until he came to be heard. No cleric was to leave his own bishop and communicate with (attach himself to) another. No one but a bishop was under any circumstances to make the chrism, that is, the holy oil used in confirmation; every church in a diocese was, before Easter, to send deacons to fetch the chrism from the bishop, without whose knowledge, says the canon generally, in an Ignatian tone, "*nihil penitus faciendum*." One remarkable provision shows that the church recognised as married women some who in the eye of the law were only "*concubinæ*."

It is evident, from what appears on the face of the Toledan

Canons, that Priscillianism, that strange compound of Pantheistic, Gnostic, and Manichean ideas, combined with a license of systematic dissimulation which enhanced the odium incurred by its theology, had still a hold on many minds in the Spanish Church, despite of the censures of the Council of Saragossa in 380, and the cruel execution of Priscillian and others in 385. But the Council of Toledo, it is said, had the satisfaction of receiving the recantations of several bishops of the party—such as Dictinius and Symphosius, whose case Ambrose had examined, and towards whom he had advised favour to be shown, if they renounced the heresy and fulfilled certain conditions, and Paternus of Braga, who declared that the writings of Ambrose had reclaimed him from misbelief. Another bishop, Herenas, adhered to his Priscillianist opinions; he, of course, was excommunicated. The penitents, bishops or others, were promised absolution or admission to Church-fellowship, if they gave proof of their sincerity by abstaining for the present from conferring orders, or by subscribing a formula sent by the Council, *and* if “the Pope who now is,” and Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, and the other bishops concerned in or acquainted with the case, should reply to the Council’s letters in a sense favourable to their reception.

“The Pope that now is”—this brief clause, in its emphatic terseness, is so premonitory of the coming development of Roman Church power, that the thoughts which it suggests almost make us forget everything else connected with this first Council of Toledo. “For this,” says Fleury, “is the first time we find the bishop of Rome simply styled *the* Pope, by way of eminence;” and as the title was, at this time and long afterwards—as we see in the letters of Apollinaris Sidonius—freely given to prelates of far less eminent sees, while in the East it was distinctively applied to the bishop of Alexandria, one is led to ascribe this designation, if the passage be genuine, to the lofty assumptions of Siricius in his dealings with the Church of Spain. We have but to add that “the Pope” at this time was Anastasius I., who succeeded Siricius at the end of 398.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM BEFORE HIS TROUBLES.

WE must now change the scene to the capital of the Eastern empire, and enter on the survey of a career which, perhaps beyond all others in Church history, associates the rich endowments of mind and the spiritual beauty of a thoroughly religious life with the glory of a great preacher and the brighter crown of a sufferer for righteousness. It is impossible for Christians even to name John Chrysostom—the epithet appears to have been first given him in the latter half of the fifth century—without recognising in his character and in his trials a signal specimen of the “greater works” of divine grace, and a vivid fulfilment of the assurance that cross-bearing is the condition of true victory. We have to see him removed from Antioch to the see of Constantinople, and bearing himself there as one who could toil and endure to all lengths, but who could not betray the right or conform to the world, and who therefore had to find in the world’s hostility his access to completed saintship and to the love of Christian generations through all time.

It was on the 27th of September, 397, that Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, died after a sixteen years’ episcopate. The see was great enough to become, at once, the object of many ambitious longings and many scandalous intrigues. To be the second bishop in Christendom, and withal the pastor of an imperial court; to have opportunities of exercising influence over the twenty-eight provincial churches of Thrace, of “Asia,” and of Pontus; to preside over a distinguished body of clergy, and to have at command the pomp and splendour of an august official position; to dwell in a palace furnished like a senator’s, and to entertain the chief men of the capital with magnificent hospitality;—this was a prospect naturally fascinating to ecclesiastics of that secular tone of mind

which had been so bitterly, yet so sorrowfully, denounced by the single-minded predecessor of Nectarius, when he found himself too unworldly to content the "genius loci" of New Rome. And here the miserably low standard accepted by many ecclesiastics appears in the vulgar and degrading self-abasement by which various aspirants for the brilliant prize were not ashamed to show how far removed they were from the spirit of Gregory Nazianzen; how little difference they practically recognised between the see of Constantinople and any lucrative place in civil government; how little they would have understood Chrysostom's expressed amazement that persons should be eager for so vast a burden! Twenty-six years before, he had described in his work on "The Priesthood" (*i.e.* the Episcopate) the party intrigues which accompanied an episcopal election. In the present case the excitement was like what might have awaited the appointment of a high-chamberlain, or the election, or quasi-election, of a quæstor. "Men who are no men," says Chrysostom's biographer Palladius—commonly identified with Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia—"men who were courting the prelacy, presbyters themselves in dignity but unworthy of the priesthood, came running together; some knocking at the doors of the palace, some setting to work with bribes, and some fawning humbly on the populace." The Church-people, he proceeds, "were greatly agitated, and began to urge on the Emperor their desire to have some one chosen who understood a bishop's work."

The appointment thus depended on the will of Arcadius, who was now a little more than twenty years old, and was under the guidance of a favourite who had first superseded Rufinus, and had then, as Gibbon says, "accomplished his ruin and soon imitated his vices." This was the "bald old man" Eutropius, who became, like Rufinus, a mark for Claudian's scathing invective, but whose rise to power and greatness inspired the poet with an even deeper loathing and scorn. Though not yet at the height of his fortunes, he was high-chamberlain to the Emperor: he had checkmated Rufinus by inducing Arcadius to marry a beautiful Frank maiden named Eudoxia, the daughter of Bauto, a barbarian who had held office as Master of the Soldiery: he had gathered round him "a swarm of parasites," who were his "boon companions" and loud-voiced flatterers. Already his greed of gain (which won for him from Claudian the epithet *carpo famosus honorum*) had been fed, but not satisfied, by wholesale

extortion ; already he had attained the dignity of " patrician," which carried with it that of " father of the Emperor ;" and within the same month which ended the life of Nectarius, fear of a hostile intrigue had made him utilise Arcadius for the promulgation of a monstrous law, extending the penalties of treason to any conspiracy against any of the imperial counsellors and officers, military or civil.

Such was the position, in this autumn, of the man whose will would determine the Emperor's selection of an archbishop ; for, says Zosimus, he " lorded it over Arcadius as over an animal." But for once the all-powerful prefect of the bedchamber was not swayed by regard for the highest bidder or the most abject sycophant. There is something almost mysterious in the fact that he determined to put forward the famous preacher of Antioch, John Chrysostom. Like many other bad or base men, he appears to have known a good and high-souled one when he came across him : in this case, he had become acquainted with Chrysostom's character when the Emperor's affairs had brought him to Antioch ; and, as Dean Stephens remarks in his " Life of Chrysostom," the appointment might procure him some popularity. He therefore caused Arcadius to order the " Count " of the " Oriental diocese " (equivalent to the Vicar of other prefectures) to send Chrysostom " quietly " to Constantinople. The latter, who was now a man of about fifty, and had been in holy orders for sixteen years, had no suspicion of what was coming when he was desired to go in an imperial carriage to a martyr's chapel " outside the city," near the " Roman gate ;" on arriving he was hurried away to the first station on the road, committed to the care of two imperial messengers, and thus conveyed to the capital. It was determined to have a grand gathering of prelates for his consecration ; and among them, naturally, the patriarch or " pope " of Alexandria would be pre-eminent. Theophilus, however, was very ill pleased at the appointment. By one account, when he first saw Chrysostom, his keen insight told him that he had met his match for force of character : he would soon find, as Tillemont says, that Chrysostom had an extreme aversion to injustice. Socrates affirms that Theophilus had, for reasons characteristic of his capacity for political intrigue, a strong wish to procure the elevation of one of his own Alexandrian priests, Isidore, who had served him well, years before, in a business fraught with secrecy and danger. For a time he stood out, using all the influence of his great

place against Chrysostom's appointment: the other bishops, it is said, were on the point of hearing accusations against Theophilus himself, when Eutropius collected the various memorials which had been handed in by his enemies, and privately showed them to him, bidding him "choose between consecrating John or being put on his defence." He, of course, gave up his opposition; but he treasured up the recollection of his defeat, and never rested until he could avenge it on Chrysostom.

The consecration took place on February 26, 398. It was characteristic of the new bishop to take for the subject of his first sermon the truth of the mysteriousness of the Divine Nature. He intended, he said, to insist on this truth as against the Anomæans, whose great leader Eunomius had made the denial of it a main point of his ultra-Arianism. This sermon is not extant; but the second opens with an interesting description of Chrysostom's feeling towards his new flock. "I have discoursed to you on one day, and from that day I have loved you as much as if I had been from the first brought up among you. This is not from any particular affectionateness in my disposition; it is because you are so worthy of love." He goes on to speak of their "zeal, charity, good-will towards their teachers;" and compares their church with its sister of Antioch, within which he was "born and bred." "At Antioch," he says, "there are larger congregations" (the Christians there formed about half the whole population), "but at Constantinople the faithful show a greater firmness and steadfastness" amid a storm of surrounding heresy—it is to be observed that he was then preaching, not in the cathedral, but in a church situated in "a part of the city" where the Arians were still numerous. With this touching expression of that pastoral tenderness which, says Tillemont, "is found often, or rather everywhere, in his homilies," he began his episcopal ministry at Constantinople.

And indeed we must remember, in estimating his aptitude for this work, that he would not have been to any effective purpose the preacher "of the Golden Mouth" had not his natural gift of eloquence—an eloquence florid to Western tastes, but doubtless irresistibly fascinating to a Greek-speaking audience—been at once the ally and the instrument of a very hopeful temper, a very firm will, and a very warm heart; and if all these endowments had not been, in him as in other great preachers, transfigured, so to speak, and intensified by a vivid consciousness of the realities of faith and by the undying fire of a supernatural charity. He thus united a vast

power of sympathy, and a comprehensive versatility of insight, with the most absolute loyalty to that truth of which he was the minister; or rather, we may say, the glow and force of persuasive energy which made his words so living, and brought them home to such widely different minds, were the fruit and the token of convictions which clung fixedly to its facts and dogmas, and could see by their light the capacities and the destinies of the soul. And of him Sozomen might well say, much as Bede says of our own Augustine, that by conduct pleasing to God he inspired his hearers with an emulation of his own virtues, that he recommended his teaching by the consistency of his life, combining a "clear and brilliant expression of thoughts with strictness and purity of conduct," so that his "words were embellished by his deeds." In short, Chrysostom, whether as a preacher or as a ruler, and after all abatements made for rhetorical luxuriance on the one hand and any hastiness or impetuosity on the other, drew his strength, in the heart and core of it, from the twofold—or rather from the single—source of devotion to Christ and solicitude for Christian men.

To speak in general of his preaching. He had long before expressed his sense of the "labour which ought to be spent on public discourses to the people." He had by this time gained a large experience in this field of work, and when he came to Constantinople he was evidently expected to make preaching, in a special sense, his line. Accordingly we find that he made it a habit to preach once or twice a week; generally, doubtless, in the great church of St. Sophia, which Constantius had finished and in which Gregory had been enthroned; but also, on occasion, in other churches, as those of the Apostles, St. Paul, "the Martyrs at the Old Rock" (near the upper part of the Golden Horn), St. Irene, and the Anastasia. He spoke, it appears, sometimes from the episcopal throne at the end of the apse, but frequently, owing to a certain feebleness of voice, from the ambon in the nave, where the Scriptures were read. Sometimes he would give a course of expository lectures on some book of Scripture, as he had been wont to do at Antioch—lectures which implied that Scripture was accessible to the congregation, and that to neglect the private study of it was a grave fault: and his "Homilies" on the Acts, Philipians, Colossians, and Hebrews were thus delivered at Constantinople. But his exegesis, while it showed that he cared little for those mystical applications which were characteristic of the school of Alexandria, and while it exhibited, in its treatment

of St. Paul's writings, a remarkable power of tracing the connexion of thought and argument, always tended to a directly practical conclusion.

He soon learned that his hearers, though impressible and often enthusiastic, were fitful and unstable, and often deficient even in ordinary seriousness and reverence. They would, indeed, interrupt him by acclamations and clapping of hands, after the fashion of their age and country—sometimes, it is said, by waving their handkerchiefs, and hailing him as a “thirteenth Apostle.” In a curious passage of one of his Homilies, he tells us that he “could not but feel some satisfaction at those plaudits, but that when he returned home the thought occurred, ‘What have those people gained? or if they have profited, has not their noisy approbation spoilt it all?’” They had a real, if chiefly an emotional, affection for one whose brilliant powers were all bestowed, as they well knew, on their truest interests; he says in one place that every one of them would contribute money if he asked for it—that they would, were it possible, give part of their own flesh to save his life. They gave undeniable proof of their regard by taking his plain-spoken reproofs in a good spirit, and he on his part told them that he “greatly” desired the help of their prayers. Yet we find him complaining repeatedly of their strange incurable levity: and their frequent non-attendance at church on ordinary Sundays, their inattention, not only to sermons—of which, he says, “perhaps they retained the substance until they crossed the church threshold”—but also to the lessons, and, above all, to the Eucharistic service itself, was to him a constant matter of anxiety. It is startling to find him saying, again and again, that he seems to them to be talking idly; that they laugh at what he says when he denounces theatrical exhibitions, when he urges them to give up swearing, when he recurs frequently to the same topic. “Perhaps,” he says once, “you women there in the silk dresses are laughing.” Evidently the Greek world had made its way into the Christian Church, and brought with it a restless and puerile frivolity—which may, by the way, explain the severity with which some Fathers of a sterner tone than Chrysostom's regarded all laughter as unworthy of Christian men: as yet the sacred leaven had not done its full work in sobering and steadying the Greek volatility.

And not only, as Dean Stephens says, were their “fickleness and impulsiveness fatal obstacles to the retention of durable impressions;” but their “passionate love of pleasure, their

abandoned devotion to public amusements calculated to debase and relax the finer moral feelings, these were insuperable bars to the substantial success of the Christian reformer." There were many who gave way to the coarsest temptations—to excess in eating and drinking, to vulgar pride of wealth, and too often to laxity of morals. Chrysostom pictures the splendid houses of the rich, with their golden roofs, their pillars, marbles, cloisters, statues; the semi-circular tables, each one so huge that "two young men could scarcely move it;" the golden bowls of half a talent's weight; the wine-jars on which gold outshone silver; the train of handsome, plump, and richly dressed attendants; the varieties of expensive clothing; the income squandered on singers, mimes, flute-players, harlots: and he denounces the vicious follies akin to this passionate and elaborate self-indulgence—the frantic fondness for horse-races, for the fights between men and wild beasts (which St. Augustine construes as "the frenzy of the circus and the cruelty of the amphitheatre"), or for theatrical exhibitions even when they included the grossest offences to Christian modesty—and the scandalous habit which profaned the "intrinsic dignity of marriage" by the introduction of hired dancers for the guests' amusement. Even old men were to be seen joining with the young in tavern-revels, or hurrying to the horse-races in the thick of an excited crowd. And the heathenish spirit which thus dominated over life was not less powerful when death had invaded a household; the mourning for the dead was wild and unchristian, inconsistent with any real belief in the Resurrection and any real trust in Divine protection for survivors. "When I see," says Chrysostom, "those lamentations that are made along the forum" (*i.e.* on the way to the cemetery beyond the walls), "I am ashamed that unbelievers should observe them and scoff at us:" for in spite of all professions of faith—in spite of church-usages surrounding the last offices with tokens of joy and hope, with blazing lights and choral psalmody, such as "Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul," "I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me"—the extravagant wailings, and, yet worse, the presence of hired female mourners, gave the lie to this appearance of Christian patience and faith. These female mourners were a special offence to the bishop, one of whose most habitual feelings was that of gratitude to the Divine goodness amid affliction as well as in prosperity. "Any one who hires those wretched women—trust me, I mean what I say—shall be excluded from church for a long time, like an idolater."

Others of his flock resorted to fortune-tellers. "If," he says, "a man has lost money, there are many who advise him to go to diviners. . . . Do not you," he adds, "give the Devil pleasure by taking that step; rather give him pain by thanking God." Or they would try to cure an illness by the use of spells, and of amulets called "periapts," and stifle misgivings by saying that this was "not like idolatry."

There were other prevalent vices of tongue and temper: a hard unforgiveness, as to which Chrysostom once says, "Do let me hear that some one, after leaving church, has embraced and kissed his enemy;" a habit (such as he had censured at Antioch) of swearing to do this or that, which made him say on one occasion that he who would not give it up should be debarred from entering the church, "even were it he himself that wore the diadem;" a bitter censoriousness as to the foibles or faults of their pastors, not to say their fellow-churchmen; a "venomous envying of the well-to-do," and even of priests who were in comfortable circumstances,—a temper so prevalent among the poor that Chrysostom, in exhorting against it, appealed, although reluctantly, to secondary motives, if by any means he might abate "this destructive passion."

There was also a general indifference to the study of Scripture. "No one," he says, "has a mind to attend to the Scriptures." "This ignorance of Scripture is the cause of all evils; . . . no one knows a psalm—it is thought something to be ashamed of, to be made a jest of. You are like idle children, that are always learning the mere rudiments." There were many Church-people who never attended church. Some professing Christians would imitate the bad example of Constantine and Constantius by delaying to be baptized until their last moments, and thus depriving themselves of the blessing of a Christian life, and running the risk of a death too sudden to allow of baptism. "Believe me," he says once, "—I am not saying it merely to frighten you—I have often known people who committed many sins because they were only looking forward to baptism, and then, on their dying day, departed without it." Even among the "faithful" there were some for whom Jewish worship had a strange fascination, and some who communicated only twice a year, or only once (*i.e.* at Easter); there were some who were more or less open to the suggestions of heretics, and others who, although they professed the Christian Creed, yet dallied with heathenish objections to this or that part of it—asking,

for instance, "why Christ had not come sooner," perplexing themselves with questions as to God's dealings with the heathen world, denying that the body, or at any rate that the bodies of all men, would be reconstructed after dissolution, and (what seems to have distressed Chrysostom beyond all other aberrations) assuming that God's mercy would prevent the actual accomplishment of the doom denounced in Scripture against the wicked, as if, said Chrysostom, "God would fulfil His promises but not His threats." These speculations were advanced, in some cases, by persons who were only half-believers. Chrysostom, in a most remarkable sentence, acknowledges the compatibility of some doubt with belief; but he strove with all his might to lead his hearers on to a full belief, continually dissuading them from *à priori* speculations on matters decided by the express word of God, and emphatically insisting, as on the long-suffering Divine mercy which perpetually invited sinners to repentance—as on the possibility of a true conversion of the will to God—as on the certainty of pardon after such conversion—as on the inexpressible happiness of a life spent in union with the will of God and crowned by admission to His beatific Presence—so also on the terrors of the Day of Judgment, and on the hopeless condition of the reprobate. He was eminently a preacher of love *and* of fear: he never allowed his sense of Divine tenderness to make him silent about the result of persistent impenitence; and once when preaching on this point, he broke down with emotion.

Chrysostom was, in truth, one of the most practical of preachers. His one object, says Tillemont, was "to instruct his people and promote their salvation." He might here and there press the particular point which he was urging in a somewhat one-sided way; but he did insist on this and that plain duty as the test of a vital Christian belief—the duty of prayer, or of Scripture-reading, or of guarding against spiritual "drowsiness," or of progressive efforts after holiness, or of almsgiving (on which he loved to dwell), or of patience amid distress, or of the government of the tongue, or of purity, or of repentance and repeated appeals to Divine mercy, or of keeping Christian principles before the mind amid all the details of common life. As to this latter point, it must never be forgotten that in an age in which the prevalence of monasticism had led some to think true religion incompatible with a life in "the world," Chrysostom, who even under his mother's roof had practised monastic self-discipline, and had written, as a

younger man, "against Opponents of Monastic Life," declares the condition of one living in the world to be thoroughly consistent with true "sanctity," just as he also insists that habitual attendance at services is "not of itself piety," but is only then valuable when it makes a man "better."

It will not be supposed that Chrysostom neglected any means of impressing his people's minds, or moving their wills, when one finds him using the homeliest illustrations, such as the caution and hard practice necessary for exhibitors on the tight-rope, the keeping and feeding of house-dogs, the thanks given by beggars for alms, and the discipline exercised by athletes at the Olympian festival. It was with him an instinct to vary his topics, disdaining nothing that might serve his turn; if this would not answer, then something else must be tried. The soil was, indeed, sadly thin and shallow. Did he, at times, realise the very partial character of his success?

To turn to his administration of his diocese. Knowing well that the bishop's own house must be a visible example of the strictness which he would preach, he banished from it every form of luxury. The rich furniture left by his predecessor was sold for a large sum. Even some church-vessels, apparently, were thus disposed of, and the money went to support a hospital. Chrysostom did not take for himself any part of his episcopal income; he spent it on charitable works, and a pious lady named Olympias, the widow of the ex-prefect Nebridius, who had been highly esteemed by Nectarius and had attended the death-bed of another bishop, claimed the privilege of supporting him: as Palladius says, she saved him from all anxiety about his daily food. "Little it was that he took of that; he dined alone, and, like Olympias, on vegetables—as he said, on account of weak health; he never drank wine because it gave him headaches: sometimes he forgot to eat till evening." It is obvious that he would not have been at home in the high society of Constantinople; he was in this respect a second Gregory. The thin, shrivelled, stunted figure, the bald head, the mean dress, would have seemed out of place amid the gorgeous personages who had been wont to exchange amenities with the ex-senator Nectarius; but even allowing for these disqualifications, and for his objection to spending money and time on banquets, it was a mistake on the part of the bishop of a great capital to incur the reputation of churlish moroseness by omitting a large part, at least, of episcopal hospitality. His solitary meals were not unnaturally represented

as a token of a churlish, reserved, and unsocial temper; and his own beloved St. Paul's example did not make him in this respect attempt to be all things to all men. He was, says Stephens, "too much the saint of the cloister." The change from the habits of his predecessor was too abrupt on all sides. His clergy felt it, in some cases not to their satisfaction, when he strove to reclaim them from secularity and self-indulgence, exhorted them not to pay court to rich men for the sake of invitations and so degrade themselves to the level of parasites (after the fashion of the younger Roman clerics), and, with yet greater earnestness, combated the abuse associated with the name of "spiritual sisters" or *subintroductæ*—"always," says Professor Bury, "a snare, even if it were often innocent." He deposed and excommunicated two deacons for adultery and homicide, and brought men of promise and character into the ranks of his clergy, such as Proclus, afterwards one of his successors, and John Cassian, whom he ordained deacon. But he made a bad choice when he gave his confidence, in Church matters, to the hot-tempered archdeacon Sarapion, who, if we can believe Socrates on this point, actually exclaimed in the presence of the clergy, "You will never, O bishop, be able to govern these men, unless you drive them all with one stick"—a speech followed up by the ejection of several ecclesiastics.

It may be that Chrysostom was too indifferent to the small social amenities of life; a shoemaker complained that he could not get the bishop to stop and talk to him; and it seems clear that, like some other reformers, he was disposed to make short work of abuses and scandals—to allow too little for old habits—to expect too much, and too soon—and to be over-sharp in punishing when his zeal was roused against long-established laxity. In this he resembled one who often thus caused his good to be evil spoken of, our own Laud. He looked over the accounts of the Church treasurer or steward, and found needless expenditure, which he promptly cut off. He was severe to those monks who (as so many did both then and afterwards) "left their cells and showed themselves in the city." He summoned before him the guild of Church-widows, and rebuked those whom he found living self-indulgently; bidding them "take to fasting, abstain from the bath, put away their superfluous fineries,"—or else, for the credit of religion, marry again. He rebuked the faults of the higher classes with a bluntness which astonished them: he complained boldly of some acts of injustice, and offered advice to Arcadius and

the Empress Eudoxia ; and he dealt as plainly with the foibles of some vain and self-indulgent court ladies as John Knox dealt with the “Queen’s Maries,” or, at any rate, as Wesley dealt with over-dressed female Methodists. In order to rekindle a spirit of devotion among his flock, he instituted a system of psalmody in which they were all to take their part ; and he exhorted them to rise for prayer during the night—descanting on the moral advantages of such prayers, offered at a time when “the soul is clearer, lighter, more aspiring,” when thoughts of penitence and awe might have freer course. He showed his charity in the most practical way, according to Theodoret, by lending a ready ear to all entreaties from the afflicted : “one man invokes his aid against an oppressor, another in a lawsuit, another craves for food or clothing ;” he is described as going to visit the sick and the prisoners, to heal domestic strife, to provide travellers with lodging, to relieve widows and orphans, to prove himself the common father of all. If he had no time for “small talk,” he had always time for active sympathy.

While he was thus making a great impression on all classes of his flock, save those whose faults he had censured with special sternness, he also attracted many pagans and heretics to the Church ; among the latter was an adherent of the heresy of his predecessor Macedonius, and probably some of that ancient Marcionite sect which he often mentions as still vigorous at Constantinople. He aided the Catholic Goths resident at Constantinople in the conversion of their Arian brethren, sent some persons who could speak the Scythian language to officiate and work on the banks of the Danube, and wrote for the same object to Leontius, bishop of Ancyra. The Novatianizing Socrates tells a story of Chrysostom’s conversing with the Novatian bishop Sisinnius, famous for his humorous repartees—who, as he also says, had been greatly offended by hearing of Chrysostom’s language on the ample pardon of all sins in the Church. Tillemont does not believe that Chrysostom procured the enactment of Arcadius’s law of March, 398, against the Eunomians : “The saint’s spirit was hostile to heresy rather than to heretics.” Yet he wrote to the prelate of a district in Euphratesia where Marcionism was rife, and offered him the aid of the State in rooting out the heresy. And hearing from Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza, that idolatry was still openly practised in that district, he procured through Eutropius an order for destroying the idols, and

at a later time employed some rich ladies to pay the expenses of carrying out another mandate for the destruction of temples in Phœnicia.

One thing on which his heart was much set was the restoration of communion between the Western Church and his beloved master and former bishop, Flavian. This he effected with the co-operation of Theophilus. A deputation, consisting of Acacius, bishop of Bœrœa, and Isidore, whom Theophilus had wished to see raised to the chair of Constantinople, visited Rome, and obtained from Anastasius—now that Paulinus and his successor Evagrius were dead—a recognition of Paulinus's old rival. The schism was not absolutely healed, for the Eustathians still worshipped apart at Antioch; but the object of Chrysostom was gained when at last the bishop of Rome greeted Flavian as rightful bishop of Antioch.

One of the first remarkable occurrences of his episcopate which belongs strictly to the affairs of Constantinople was the transference of certain relics of martyrs from St. Sophia to the church of "St. Thomas in Drypia," some nine miles distant. Chrysostom shared in the overstrained feeling of his time toward such remains of great saints—a feeling which had found, perhaps, its most vivid expression in the triumphal procession which he, as a boy, may have seen escorting the coffin of St. Babylas from the grove of Daphne to Antioch. On the present occasion, the Empress Eudoxia was the prominent figure in the throng which attended the relics. It was done by night; the whole city seemed to pour out its population to share in the solemnity, and to stretch "a living sea," as Chrysostom describes it, from the great church to Drypia. As on the memorable day when Meletius's body was borne forth from Constantinople, the long lines of men and women of every class, each with torch in hand, "presented the appearance of a river of fire." Eudoxia kept close to the relics, with her hand upon their coffin and pall; and Chrysostom, when their final resting-place was reached, pronounced an enthusiastic discourse, so eulogistic of the empress as certainly to suggest that in his excitement he forgot what befitted a religious function, and so extravagant in its expressions of delight as to give occasion for not unreasonable complaint at a later time. On the next day Arcadius visited the new shrine, without any of his imperial ornaments; after his departure Chrysostom preached another discourse in a much more sober tone.

The year 399 was long remembered at Constantinople. For one

thing, a violent storm of rain fell, and did great mischief to the fields, "bowing down the waving corn," on Wednesday in Holy Week, April 6. The bishop led a multitudinous procession to the Church of the Apostles; there, he says, "we took as our patrons Peter and Andrew, Paul and Timothy," which must mean that they invoked their intercession, according to a custom which had at least been greatly stimulated by enthusiasm for the memory of martyrs. Then, crossing the Bosphorus, they visited the church of SS. Peter and Paul; or, as he expresses it, "daring the waves, we hastened to the Coryphæi," *i.e.* the Prince-Apostles. All the city seemed thoroughly moved, but Good Friday showed in the strangest and saddest way how superficial was this apparent devotion. The people rushed to some horse-races in their magnificent Hippodrome—which stood on the western side of the imperial palace, separated from St. Sophia by the Augustæum,—and the bishop, deserted by his auditors, had to sit in his own house opposite the north-east end of the Hippodrome, and to hear the wild shouts and laughter which greeted the rival charioteers, and which, as he says, bowed him down to the ground for grief and shame. "This, in the city of the Apostles! this on the very day of the Crucifixion!" Nor was this profanation enough: on Holy Saturday they went "as from smoke into fire," crowding to gaze on a demoralizing theatrical representation. On Easter Day, as Montfaucon supposes, Chrysostom delivered the indignant sermon now extant "Against the Games and the Theatre." On Low Sunday he would not preach, but desired the aged bishop of Ancyra, Leontius, to do so; whereupon many of the people went away in disgust. On the second Sunday after Easter, he preached to a large congregation—rejoicing, as he says, that his sharp rebukes had told upon them. To this same Eastertide Montfaucon refers an interesting sermon before Catholic Goths, assembled in one of the churches of the city. Chrysostom first called on some of them to stand forth and read part of their own version of Scripture (the famous work of Ulfilas), then desired a Gothic presbyter to preach, and finally preached himself on the comprehensiveness of the gospel which united barbarians with Greeks in the kingdom of Him who had been worshipped by the Magi.

But a great catastrophe was at hand, which fixed the attention alike of Chrysostom and of his people on the changed fortunes of the favourite of Arcadius. It was at the beginning of the year that the eunuch Eutropius, by becoming consul, outdid, in Claudian's

opinion, all the monstrosities of legend. He had been saluted, in his new dignity, by clamorous adulation: there had been shouts of applause, dances, banquets, a blaze of lights, garlands and tapestry displayed from the houses; a throng of parasites attended on him as he passed along the streets; his ascendancy over the Emperor seemed secure. But his fall took place about half a year after his consulate began. Tribigild, an Ostrogoth chief, menaced Constantinople from Phrygia; Gainas, the Gothic "master-general of the East," animated, it was said, by hatred of Eutropius, "extorted permission to negotiate with Tribigild," entered into a secret understanding with him, and announced to Arcadius that peace must be bought with the head of the eunuch-consul. Eudoxia, who had personal reasons for hostility to Eutropius, induced her husband to submit, and to order Eutropius to be executed; whereupon the unhappy minister fled for shelter to that same sanctuary of the church which, we are told, he had stripped of its privilege of asylum. Socrates describes Eutropius as having procured a law "forbidding any one to take refuge in churches, and ordering those who did so to be dragged forth;" and Sozomen adds that he carried this out against the wife of Timasius, a general whom he banished to the Oasis. The reference is probably to the law of July 27, 398, which restricted the intervention of monks or clerics in behalf of criminals. If this law was framed by Eutropius, he must have the credit of a measure which in fact was called for by a grave abuse, and which expressly provided against a hasty infliction of death by allowing time for "appeal" and further inquiry.

Chrysostom had remonstrated against what, in a Churchman's eyes at that time, would seem an encroachment on the Church's rights; and he had warned Eutropius of the uncertainty of worldly power and riches. Both warning and remonstrance had been resented: but Chrysostom did not hesitate to protect the fugitive. The Emperor sent soldiers to seize him; then, according to Chrysostom, the old man became pale as a corpse, his voice quivered, he shook all over with terror and despair. The soldiers clamoured for their prey. The bishop hid Eutropius in the sacristy, and confronted the angry faces which seemed to menace his own life; he allowed himself to be led, as if a prisoner, to the palace, where he easily induced Arcadius—apparently a kindly-natured man, though a weak prince—to plead with the soldiers himself, and urge them to let the good deeds of Eutropius be

set against the maladministration which had produced the present trouble. It must have been a strange sight, the Augustus stooping to supplicate his soldiers, who, more zealous than he himself for what they deemed the interest of the State, actually brandished their spears in his sacred presence. However, he prevailed; and next day St. Sophia was crowded by such a multitude as an Easter festival might have drawn together. The bishop ascended the ambon and caused the curtain of the chancel to be drawn aside, so that all could see the wretched suppliant crouching under the holy table, "more frightened," as Chrysostom rather coarsely puts it, "than a hare or a frog." "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" such were the first words from the golden lips; "words," he proceeded, "always seasonable, but never more seasonable than now." He dilated on the tremendous change of fortune which had befallen the once all-powerful minister; and though he could not refrain from some rhetorical triumph as he reminded Eutropius of the attempt made to abolish the privilege of asylum which he had now invoked, and which for the present secured his life, he moved the vast audience to sympathy, and exhorted them to address the Emperor in favour of Eutropius. The fugitive, some days later, was able to quit the church; his life was spared, but he was banished to Cyprus with every mark of legal degradation. Chrysostom preached a second sermon on his case, bidding the audience observe that the Church had not betrayed him—he had freely left her precincts; and then the preacher went on to general reflections on the fearlessness characteristic of true Christians, the instability of riches and of apparent popularity, the transitoriness of all earthly life, the safety to be found in union with Christ and in the bosom of His Church. It remains to add that Eudoxia did not rest until she obtained an order for bringing the unhappy exile to trial at Constantinople; and, on the highly suspicious pretext of having assumed the Emperor's insignia, he was condemned and beheaded at Chalcedon before the end of 399.

The humiliation of the imperial name was redoubled in the year following, when Gainas, having openly joined his forces to those of Tribigild, with whom he had had a secret understanding, compelled Arcadius to receive him on his own terms into Constantinople, which, in the expressive phrase of Socrates, was "barbarianized" by the "myriads," bent on plunder and destruction, that owned him as their chief. He demanded that a church should be given up to him for the Arian worship. Arcadius, it

is said, represented to Chrysostom the difficulty in which he found himself, and "requested him to appease Gainas by making this concession." Chrysostom acted like Ambrose: "I never will consent to expel believers in the Godhead of the Word, and surrender the temple to those who blaspheme Him." By his desire Gainas and he were confronted with each other; and, as Theodoret tells the story, Gainas pleaded that he wanted some place in which to pray. "You can pray in any of the churches." "But I belong to another communion, and my services to the empire give me a right to have a church for myself and my friends." "Your rewards," returned Chrysostom, "exceed your services." Theodoret, who probably, after his manner, invented a good deal of this colloquy, affirms that "the teacher of the world" fairly silenced the Goth. For the moment a peace was patched up between Arcadius and Gainas: but soon afterwards the latter finally broke with the empire, and so greatly alarmed its capital that Chrysostom undertook to go as an envoy to him in Thrace, whereupon Gainas showed his respect by drawing the bishop's hand over his own eyes and placing his children at the bishop's knees. His march northward was opposed by the Huns, and he fell in battle with them a few weeks after he had quitted Constantinople.

The see of Constantinople, as we have already learned, had not received from the Council of 381 any definite jurisdiction over the Thracian "diocese," still less over those of Pontus and "Asia." But occasions would arise in which the intervention of the second church in Christendom would be naturally requested, and thereby a right of control virtually established which might be consolidated, as it was at the Fourth Œcumenical Council, into a canonical supremacy.

Thus we find that when, some time before September, 400, a number of bishops met at Constantinople on Church business, a Lydian prelate named Eusebius stood up and denounced his primate, Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus, then present, on various grounds, accusing him of sacrilege and simony. Chrysostom, being in his own church, was presiding over this irregular quasi-synod; and to him, therefore, the accusation was presented. He attempted to hush up the matter. "Brother Eusebius," said he, "men often bring forward charges under the impulse of angry feeling, and do not always find it so easy to make them good. Withdraw your charge, I beg of you; and then we will set right all that is wrong without

any judicial formality." Eusebius was simply irritated by this pacific suggestion. Chrysostom then desired the bishop of Heraclea, the metropolitan of his own church, to try his hand at quieting down the accuser; and he himself went into the cathedral with the other bishops to celebrate the Eucharist. He had just given the opening benediction, "Peace be with you," when Eusebius, in the height of excitement, followed, went up to the bishop's seat in the apse, and handed in a duplicate of the accusations, adjuring Chrysostom, "by the life of the Emperor, to do justice." To prevent disturbance, Chrysostom took advantage of the pause just before the commencement of the liturgy of the faithful to withdraw, requesting another bishop named Pansophius to "offer the gifts," and resumed consideration of the case after service; the place chosen was the baptistery, afterwards the scene of sacrilegious violences on the part of Chrysostom's foes. All his attempts to modify Eusebius's resolution being found fruitless, he went formally into the matter, beginning with the charge of simony, as "the most horrible of all." Antoninus denied it point-blank, and so did those who were said to have bribed or paid him; but as there was some insufficiency of evidence, Chrysostom undertook to go into Proconsular Asia, and investigate the case on the spot. Thereupon Antoninus, by using the secret influence of a court magnate whose Asiatic estates were under his management (a curious revival of an abuse censured by St. Cyprian), procured from the Emperor a prohibitory message to Chrysostom, "It befits not you, our bishop, to leave the city at a perilous time"—it was before the Gainas outbreak. Chrysostom saw through the device, and induced the meeting of bishops to send three of their number into Asia to examine witnesses: but one of them was a friend of Antoninus, and feigned sickness; and the latter eluded all inquiry by actually bribing the original accuser to keep the witnesses back.

A scandalous state of things was thus prolonged in the Ephesian diocese. But Antoninus's death followed very shortly, and the bishops and clergy conjured Chrysostom to visit Ephesus and correct abuses which had been fostered in part by Arianism and in part by corrupt and secularized clergy, some of whom were now intriguing for the bishopric. It was the January of 401; Chrysostom was unwell, but he disregarded all difficulties, and after a troublesome voyage, arrived in Ephesus, having left Severian, bishop of Gabala, as his representative at home. A

Council was held. Chrysostom, who presided as the arbiter invoked, stopped the debates as to the choice of a bishop for Ephesus by putting forward his own deacon Heraclides, as one who could not be the object of any local preference or antipathy, without considering how such a step might be misrepresented; and Heraclides was enthroned by seventy bishops. Eusebius then renewed his charges: six prelates (not, as Theophilus afterwards said, sixteen) who had been simoniacally consecrated were confronted with the witnesses, and at last pleaded guilty, pretending that they had understood the money to be only what was usually paid for exemption from "curial" or municipal burdens. It was ordered that they should be deposed, but allowed still to communicate within the sanctuary, and be reimbursed by the heirs of Antoninus.

Chrysostom then proceeded to depose Gerontius, bishop of Nicomedia, whose story was a strange one enough. He had been deacon under Ambrose; he had there pretended to have caught a monster of a demon-kind, and set it to do slave's work in a mill: for this romancing he was put under penance, but being a man of resource, skilful in medicine and a plausible speaker, he quitted Milan, and "as if laughing Ambrose to scorn" repaired to Constantinople and gained friends in the imperial palace, by whose influence he acquired his see. No less dignified a prelate than Helladius of Cæsarea—perhaps during the vacancy of the see of Constantinople, perhaps by the consent of Nectarius—performed the consecration, in return, we are assured, for Gerontius's exertions in procuring for his son a high post at the court. Ambrose, justly indignant, wrote to Nectarius, urging him to depose Gerontius; but the Nicomedians had become so much attached to their new prelate, and set so high a value on his medical services rendered to rich and poor alike, that they stoutly resisted Nectarius when he took up the case (as he did in earnest), and practically obliged him to let Gerontius alone. But they had now to deal with a loftier spirit. Chrysostom deposed Gerontius, and appointed in his place an amiable man named Pansophius, who had been "pædagogus," or guardian-servant, to Eudoxia. But in this proceeding the consent of the people had been—it would be said, unavoidably—dispensed with: they were vehement in their resistance, even making processions in the streets of their own city and of Constantinople, as if, says Sozomen, there had been an earthquake or a drought, singing psalms and praying that

"their bishop Gerontius" might be spared to them. All his kindnesses were recounted, and his merits, whatever they were, exaggerated; but Chrysostom was immovable, and he had power to carry out his sentence. The Nicomedians had at last to give way: they received Pansophius, but "with fear and hatred;" and this case, with that of the other deposed prelates, while it must have endeared Chrysostom to all strict and zealous Churchmen, gave occasion to the aggrieved parties to represent him as a harsh disciplinarian, who did not hesitate to usurp authority and set at naught the rights of other bishops,—even as, later on, Theophilus of Alexandria, in a violent pamphlet, attributed his proceedings in Asia to a "passion for domineering."

Little recked Chrysostom of murmurs prompted by what, in his view, was the natural animosity of punished offenders towards a judge. He returned home, about May, 401, after some months' absence (Palladius exaggerates the time spent in the inquiry), and found his people altogether "such as he would." Their shouts of welcome "pierced the sky." They had longed for him; their Easter, without him, had lost some of its brightness: many baptisms, however, had signalised its commencement, and successful controversies had been carried on against heresy. According to Sozomen, the faithful had also been more devout, ever since the fall of Eutropius, in singing "the hymns used night and morning"—a custom which he may be right in connecting with a well-known incident which reminds us of St. Ambrose, as do some other features of Chrysostom's career. The Arians of Constantinople were not allowed to assemble for worship within the city; but usually, on Sundays and Saturdays, before holding their regular service outside the walls, they "assembled in the porticoes within the city gates" during the night, divided themselves into choirs, and sang antiphonal hymns expressive of Arian doctrine and provocative to Catholic ears; then, as morning dawned, they passed through the city, still keeping up the same chant, to their place of worship outside in the suburb called Exokionium. It must certainly have been galling for the Catholics to hear, again and again, the strain of heretical defiance, which after a time was introduced into this hymnody—"Where now are they that call the Three 'One Power'?"—and Chrysostom was naturally led to organize Catholic hymnody during the night, and on a grander scale than the Arians could achieve. The Empress entered into his plan, and provided the Catholic singers with silver crosses on

which lighted tapers were fixed. A collision, however, was the result, as any man of less impetuous zeal and more worldly wisdom would easily have anticipated. The Arians, although under the frown of the government, were too strong a body to take quietly what they regarded as an insult, and one night attacked their rivals. Briso, a member of the Empress's household, who was the appointed manager of the Catholic procession, was hit in the forehead with a stone, and some deaths took place on both sides. The Emperor thereupon forbade the Arians to sing hymns in public; but the Catholics kept up the custom for long years after.

All was not so satisfactory within the Church body as Chrysostom had at first supposed. His substitute, Severian, had become popular as a preacher; Arcadius himself admired his sermons, although his pronunciation retained something of "the harsh accent of the Syrians," which would be sure to displease the fastidious ears of Constantinople. When Chrysostom returned, Sarapion told him that Severian had been caballing against him, and trying to "steal the hearts" of his flock; and expressed his own dislike of the Syrian prelate by not rising to salute him as he passed by. Severian broke out angrily: "If Sarapion die a Christian" (or, perhaps, "a cleric"), "Christ did not become man." Witnesses came forward to denounce him for this speech; and Sarapion, it is said, actually garbled it, by suppressing the conditional clause! Even as it was uttered, it was bad enough; and, according to Socrates, Chrysostom immediately drove Severian out of the city. Eudoxia, vexed at this treatment of one whom she admired as a preacher, sent for him back from Chalcedon: great efforts were used to make Chrysostom receive him again into friendship; and at last, after Eudoxia had so far condescended as to place her infant son on Chrysostom's knees in the Apostles' church, the austere resolution of the bishop gave way. But his faithful adherents had also to be mollified; and he exhorted them for peace's sake to be reconciled to his "brother." On the next day Severian also delivered a discourse on the blessings of Christian concord; and the quarrel was thus, to all appearance, brought to an end. Here also must end our survey of the brighter days of this great episcopate: in Montfaucon's words, *ad tristitia ducimur*.

CHAPTER XXIX.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S EARLIER TROUBLES.

A GREAT storm seldom bursts without ominous tokens, like the cloud that "rose out of the sea." And so, in this case of a great individual persecution, tragical perhaps beyond all others on record, which, as we look back at it, seems to darken the whole coming in of the fifth century, we may say that an observant ecclesiastic of Constantinople in 401, who had his bishop's interest and his Church's peace at heart, could have discerned at least that both were menaced by various hostile elements, which were gathering towards a point of combination. Chrysostom, in fact, was a man to "kindle resentment" as well as to inspire affection; and, to begin nearest home, he had provoked the animosity of some clerics, especially of two priests and five deacons, whose laxity of conduct had incurred the bishop's reproof or who hated him for his zeal in the cause of discipline; and of three rich, self-important widows, whose ill-gotten wealth had been as ill employed, whose pride revolted against his stern denunciations of rapacity, while their vanity was wounded by his sarcasms about "old women dressing up like girls." There were also two or three officials attached to the court who for some reason had a grudge against Chrysostom; there were some persons whom Olympias had supplied with funds, until Chrysostom advised her to be more discriminating in her bounty; there were nobles who had taken offence at his plain speaking—he himself has said that a "man justly admonished was apt to become his monitor's foe;" and even Eudoxia had begun to dislike a preacher who had so little indulgence for court luxury, who would not condone her faults on the score of her church-going or her gifts, and perhaps we may add, whose displeasure against Severian she had soothed with so much difficulty, at the cost of so much humiliation. Three bishops must be mentioned as hostile to him on special

grounds: Severian, who had not really forgotten, or forgiven, his ejection from the city; Antiochus of Ptolemais, who was so pleasing a speaker that he himself was by some styled "Chrysostom;" and Acacius of Bercea, who, on visiting Constantinople, was disgusted to find that he was not to be entertained at the bishop's house, and said in the presence of certain clerics, "I will cook a dish for him!" These prelates, Palladius tells us, endeavoured, through inquiries at Antioch carried on by a monk named Isaac, to find out something against Chrysostom's character; and failing to do so, they sent to Alexandria and invoked the aid of Theophilus. But before we trace the line which that prelate took in regard to one whose appointment had so much annoyed him, we must look back somewhat to a controversy in which he had involved himself—the famous, though painful, dispute on the merits or demerits of Origen's theology; or, as it was more personally regarded at that time, on the theological position of the great Alexandrian himself, who had died about a hundred and fifty years before.

This question, as we may remember, had separated two old friends, whose intimacy might otherwise have ranked among the many beautiful friendships of Christian history. Jerome had been a great admirer of Origen's writings; in 384 he had scornfully put aside the imputation of heresy, as brought against Origen by mean men jealous of his fame. But in 393 he had disowned the charge of being an "Origenist," when brought against him by a zealot named Aterbius, and had distinguished between what he approved and what he rejected in the various speculations of a voluminous writer. Rufinus of Aquileia, who was at that time in Palestine and lived only at a short distance from Jerome, had equally been accused of Origenizing, but had remained silent. Then, about Easter of 394, ensued the acrimonious discussion into which Epiphanius, in the heat of his anti-Origenizing zeal, drew John, bishop of Jerusalem; and Jerome supported the rough old Cypriot bishop against a prelate who had, as he thought, more thorough sympathy with Origenistic theorisings than he chose to avow, and who, provoked by Epiphanius, had spoken violently against superstitious or unspiritual ideas of God. The contest became bitter between Jerome and Epiphanius on the one hand, and Rufinus and John on the other; and painful personalities were mingled, on both sides, with the real and grave issues raised by the whole discussion.

After allowing for much prejudice and injustice, we must acknowledge that, noble as was Origen's life, and splendid as was the example which it gave to Christian students, he had Platonized over much (although, Dr. Bigg considers, less than Clement) in his anxiety to commend Christianity to inquirers bred up in Greek schools. The following points may be taken as summarising the peculiarities which caused disquiet: (1) the extent to which he carried allegorism in his interpretation both of the Old and New Testaments; (2) his bold recourse to the theory of the pre-existence of souls, as all essentially equal and free, and susceptible, according to their varying moral positions, of disciplinary and corrective treatment in various worlds; (3) in his Christology, the recognition of Christ's eternal Sonship and essential Deity was discounted by his assertion that prayer in the proper sense was due to the Father alone; (4) a "Clementine" disparagement of Christ's redemptive work as compared with His illuminative; (5) an apparent, though tentative, approach to Universalism, both as regarded the wicked among men and Satan himself; (6) a supposed negation of the resurrection of the body, which, however, might be merely an insistence on the spiritual or Pauline view of it; (7) the vacillation and inconsistency of his statements, which seemed to involve all Christian doctrine in a haze, so that minds of the conservative type did not see what he would be at, or where his speculations would issue. Such minds might honestly, and not unreasonably, be perplexed about "Origenism."

Yet even Jerome could not deny that Origen was not altogether heterodox; he often said that he read Origen discriminatingly, and appreciated his wonderful industry and devout zeal. "Don't think," he once says, "that I condemn all that Origen wrote; this is how his indiscriminating admirers misrepresent me." But the anti-Origenistic movement seemed so likely to be itself indiscriminating, that John and Rufinus wrote to Theophilus, hoping to enlist his support; they thought that Theophilus, as a scholarly and well-informed person, would throw his weight on the side opposed to that narrow and unspiritual mode of interpreting certain passages of Scripture which was often, as we shall see, associated with the most pronounced and rigorous anti-Origenism, and the maintainers of which were stigmatized as "Anthropomorphites." It was at their request that Theophilus resolved to intervene: so that when, about Whitsuntide 396, there appeared in Palestine the Alexandrian priest Isidore, the well-known friend and

agent of Theophilus, commissioned by him to labour for peace between the opponents, Jerome regarded him as altogether a partisan of John and as an "Origenist." Isidore visited Jerome thrice, but took up a dictatorial attitude, so that nothing came of their conferences; and he returned to Egypt with a letter to Theophilus from John, which had been written "in his presence, and largely with his help," says Jerome—a letter in which John, while defending his own line of conduct, attacked Jerome in terms which the latter describes as "biting and insulting." Theophilus received from this letter an unfavourable impression respecting Jerome, and was also disposed to regard Epiphanius as an Anthropomorphite. For a time he would not write to Jerome; at last he sent him a letter, partly intended to enforce on the monk of Bethlehem his duty of obedience to the bishop of Jerusalem. Jerome answered briefly, and told Theophilus that his slackness to condemn Origenism was "displeasing to many holy persons" and would tend to strengthen the Origenistic party.

After this letter was written, Jerome was reconciled to Rufinus, when the latter was on the point of returning to Europe. They "joined hands" solemnly at a Communion in the Chapel of the Sepulchre. Rufinus, on arriving at Rome, was persuaded by one Macarius, whom he describes as "illustrious for his faith, learning, birth, and character," and who wanted arguments against fatalism, to translate into Latin the "Defence of Origen" written by the martyr Pamphilus who had been the "literary guide of Eusebius." Rufinus was loth to attempt it; he had not, he said, for thirty years done anything in Latin. But he yielded to Macarius's urgency, translated the book, and added a very short essay, intended to show that the heretical passages in Origen were, in fact, interpolations made by heretics. Not content with this gratification of his wishes, Macarius induced Rufinus to translate, in 398, Origen's work "On Principles"—the work which had given more cause for offence than any other of his writings. Rufinus prefixed to his version a few remarks, referring to Jerome, "his brother and colleague," as having set an example of translating part of Origen's writings, and also of expurgating what he translated, wherever the Greek text was at variance with orthodoxy. This freedom, extraordinary to our modern notions of fidelity, Rufinus avowed himself to have used so far as to suppress what was inconsistent with Origen's other writings. Jerome, when he became aware of it, was offended by the allusion to his own performances; he

thought it was an artifice intended to commit him, in the view of Rufinus's readers, to the same view of Origen which Rufinus took. The translation got abroad before Rufinus had fully revised it; Rufinus complained that it had been purloined from his cell by Jerome's agents, and circulated, without his sanction, in an incomplete state; and a new controversy began. The devout and learned Marcella was the first to denounce what she deemed a fresh outburst of heresy. A great many laymen, and some monks and priests, had welcomed the new translation; even Pope Siricius, in what Jerome calls his "simplicity," thought well of it, and gave Rufinus a letter of communion to be taken to the bishop of his native Aquileia, whither he was about to remove himself. But Marcella—who seems to have been not unaffected by the homage of her own circle—"publicly declared" against the book, and was joined by other Roman friends of Jerome, especially Pammachius (Paula's learned son-in-law) and Oceanus, who sent to him a copy brought to them by a "holy brother," and requested him to translate Origen's treatise himself, and so exhibit the real meaning of the author. Jerome complied; and withal wrote to his two friends, condemning Origen as a precursor of Arianism, explaining the point of view from which he had quoted him, warmly acknowledging his personal merits, contending that he should be read with critical caution, and rejecting the hypothesis that his text had been corrupted by heretics—a theory, he afterwards observed, which might have very wide application. Pammachius, on reading Jerome's version, was shocked at Origen's heterodoxy, and kept the manuscript shut up in his desk, until "a certain brother" borrowed it, and thus copies were made of it, but hastily and inaccurately, so as to throw both "order and sense" into confusion.

At this point in the dispute, Theophilus openly passed over to the side of the anti-Origenists. He had found that his position in Egypt, among a great number of ill-informed and enthusiastic monks, would be untenable if he remained under the suspicion of favouring the "heresy" which was imputed to all who did not expressly condemn Origen. The majority of these monks were wont to hate and dread all "spiritualising" treatment of Scripture; not only such as would evacuate the sacred history of its literal truth, but that by which instructed Christians in all ages—and in that age Chrysostom, Augustine, and Epiphanius himself—have interpreted its "anthropomorphic" representations of the divine nature as adaptations to the incapacity of childlike minds for

abstract ideas of God. Their habits of life indisposed them to reflection: the necessarily economic language of the Old Testament, and, in part, of the New, had become in its outward letter a constituent of their religious belief; or, as Neander well expresses it, "wholly sensuous forms of conception" were to them the only way of apprehending that which was held fast by their religious consciousness, so that "he who robbed them of the one seemed also to deprive them of the other." They "took," says Sozomen, "the sacred words about the eyes, face, hands of God, without examination." Their archbishop, in his Paschal letter of 399, had insisted, peremptorily and absolutely, on the immateriality of God. A great storm of indignation followed. One venerable Anthropomorphite, Sarapion, was indeed convinced by discussion with a deacon from Cappadocia; but the shock to his religious feelings was so great that while he and his brethren were engaged in devotion, he burst into tears and exclaimed, "They have taken away my God, and I know not whom to adore!" The idea of God had become a blank to him, when he was deprived of his old material medium of conceiving it. But the temper of many of his brethren was much more obstinate; they actually hastened to Alexandria, and menaced the archbishop as an impious man deserving of death. He readily and smoothly answered, "I look on you as on the face of God." It was enough: he had pronounced one of their favourite phrases, and they assumed that he used it in their sense. "Why, then," they demanded in the dictatorial tone assumed at that time by many monks, and illustrative of one of the abuses of monasticism, "why do you not condemn Origen?" "I have already," he answered, "resolved on doing so."

Was it, men might well ask, in consequence of simple conviction as to the errors involved in Origen's theology that Theophilus took this unexpected course? We have seen one of his personal reasons, and we are told by Palladius, the biographer of Chrysostom—who, however, it must be remembered, is a hostile witness—that there was another such behind: he had quarrelled with, or rather had conceived an animosity against, his old friend Isidore, the "hospitaller" of his church, on account of an affront put upon him, as he conceived, by Isidore's fulfilment of the solemn charge given him by a rich Alexandrian widow, to spend a thousand pieces of gold in buying clothes for poor women without the knowledge of the archbishop—who was certain, if he got

hold of the money, to spend it on "buildings which were not needed by the Church." Theophilus, we are told, found out this transaction: the money was spent, and he said nothing at the time; but two months later, he handed to Isidore a paper containing a terrible accusation, endeavoured to hire secretly a person who should play the part of accuser, and, when the attempt failed, excommunicated Isidore, who fled for shelter to the Nitrian cells. Here, then, lay another inducement to an attack upon Origenism, since the recluses of that famous monastic settlement, "on the saltpetre mountain which bordered on the Scetic desert," were opposed to anthropomorphism, and were regarded accordingly as Origenists.

Theophilus, having once determined to begin work as an anti-Origenist, acted with characteristic determination. He denounced the Origenists in a synod held late in 399 or early in 400; he forbade the reading of Origen's works; he wrote to Anastasius, the successor of Siricius, exhorting him to put down Origenism in Italy: and Anastasius, who was probably out of his depth in the matter, condemned Origenism in a Roman synod, informed the bishop of Milan to that effect, and summoned Rufinus to Rome to purge himself from the charge of misbelief. Still, Anastasius was not disposed to assume, without proof, that Rufinus was committed to Origenism; he wrote to John of Jerusalem, saying that Rufinus's intention in translating the offensive treatise was known to God only, and *if* he meant to expose Origen's unsoundness his work was to be approved. Rufinus naturally considered himself aggrieved by the reading at Milan, on the part of Eusebius the pope's messenger, of an incorrect copy of his work, and also by Jerome's letter to Pammachius; and he wrote his two books of *Apology* (otherwise insidiously known as his "*Invectives*") by way of reply to Jerome—but before he received Jerome's first two books of attack upon him—and he also sent a shorter "*Apology*" to Anastasius. In this latter production he insisted on his lifelong professed Churchmanship, set forth his belief in terms of studied orthodoxy—especially as to the Resurrection and the Judgment—professed himself to be the translator, not the champion, of Origen, and excused himself on the ground of ill-health from going to Rome. It is observable that he sets up as a standard the faith taught at Rome, Alexandria, his own Aquileia, and Jerusalem. To get clear of this painful quarrel, let it be said that Jerome attacked Rufinus in two books which were conveyed by some

"trader" to Aquileia after Rufinus had finished his own two books of Apology; and the latter had but "two days" allowed him by this hasty man of business, in which to notice Jerome's attack. The result was a vehement letter, now lost, but the purport of which can be discerned from Jerome's answer in the third book "Against Rufinus,"—a fierce answer certainly, but containing one passage in which Jerome's higher self gained the mastery: he must, for the moment, have hated the spirit of wrangling which was his bane. "I call Jesus the Mediator to witness, that I write thus most unwillingly, and unless you provoke me I will for ever be silent. . . . How can it edify the hearers to watch a duel between two old men about heretics, especially when both wish to be thought Catholics? . . . Let us condemn Origen as earnestly as we once praised him; . . . let us join hands, unite hearts. . . . We erred in youth, let us amend in old age. If you are my brother, rejoice at my coming right. If I am your friend, I ought to rejoice at your conversion." Good words, which did not come to anything; Jerome could not, or would not, believe that Rufinus did not commit himself to Origenism. The old friendship was never restored; and even when Rufinus died, Jerome allowed himself to describe the event as "the burial of a scorpion."

Wearied and angered as Rufinus was, amid the din of imputations and denunciations, he was happy in not being subject to the power of the Alexandrian see. For now, in 401, Theophilus put forth all his authority against those who, being within his jurisdiction, were suspected of Origenizing. He began the year by pronouncing strongly against Origen's errors in a Paschal letter—the first of his that is extant—towards the close of which was a sufficiently intelligible allusion to the conceit and perversity of the monks of Nitria. And now he was preparing to go beyond mere words. He had, in conjunction with Anastasius, procured from the civil power an important weapon for the anti-Origenist crusade. The two Emperors, as Anastasius expresses it, agreed to prohibit all "servants of God" from reading Origen, and to treat as criminals those who were proved to disregard the prohibition. This could be turned to account against the Nitrians; and among the latter the most eminent were those who are famous in Church history as the four Tall Brothers, Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius. They were now aged men, who in early life had retired into the southern wilderness, and built themselves cabins, where they prayed

and studied, and worked with their own hands just enough to procure a scanty subsistence. In later days they had been confessors for the faith under Valens ; they were supposed to understand the hardest passages of Scripture, and had long been honoured among the monastic fathers of Egypt. For some time they were greatly respected and liked by Theophilus. He paid them visits, as he often did to eminent monks ; and he forced on Dioscorus the bishopric of Hermopolis the Lesser, and on Eusebius and Euthymius “ the dignity of clerics ” and the stewardship of Alexandrian Church property. This took place as early as 394. Ammonius remained in the desert, and was famed for his humility and self-discipline, and also for his studiousness : he was said to know the Scriptures by heart. It was he who, when visiting Rome with Athanasius, had shown no sort of interest about any other buildings than the churches of SS. Peter and Paul, and who had cut off his left ear in order to avoid appointment to the episcopate. The connexion between the brothers and Theophilus was broken, in the first instance, by the gradual discovery, on the part of Eusebius and Euthymius, of the prelate’s worldly and avaricious temper ; they refused, in spite of his urgency, to remain with him, and returned to the desert, while—if the story given by Socrates be substantially true—he threatened them with all the consequences of provoking his wrath.

Theophilus had now, as we have seen, made his peace with the superstitious enemies of all spiritual conceptions of God ; and as the Tall Brothers were earnest maintainers of such conceptions, he must, even on that score only, have reckoned them as obstacles in his path. But, beside this, they were specially obnoxious to him as having given shelter to Isidore. Sozomen tells us that Ammonius and others interceded for Isidore with Theophilus, but obtained nothing beyond vague promises ; on further remonstrance the archbishop imprisoned one of them, and the rest, thereupon, insisted on sharing his confinement. But our earlier authority says only that, while Isidore was living quietly in his cell on the Nitrian mountain, Theophilus wrote letters to the neighbouring bishops, ordering the principal Nitrian monks to be driven away from the mountain and from the inner desert—no cause being assigned ; that they thereupon came to ask him why he treated them thus ; that he burst forth into fury, glared at them with fire in his eyes and wrath in his face, turning first pale and then livid, then writhing his lips into a bitter laugh, and making as if he would strangle

the aged Ammonius by throwing his *omophorion* or scarf over his neck, struck him on the face till the blood came, and shouted out, "Heretic, anathematize Origen!" After which, says Palladius, the vivid painter of this strange scene, they returned home, and resumed their monastic life. It can hardly be supposed that this is a plain "unvarnished tale"—the statements about the order for ejection of the Nitrians, and their quiet return, are clearly based on mistake; and it is needful to make some allowance, in this and in other cases, for the extreme hostility of Palladius to Theophilus. What seems likely is that some of the Nitrian elders did venture to plead for Isidore, and were repulsed, perhaps after some show of favourable inclination; nor is it quite improbable that Theophilus, in an access of passion, may have treated Ammonius with personal indignity.

At any rate, it appears certain that, towards the middle of 401, the archbishop carried matters to extremity. Palladius says that he excommunicated, in a Council of bishops, three of the chief monks; then suborned five of the least worthy (whom he had promoted to Church offices, even making one of them a bishop) to accuse them; then, after obtaining from the Egyptian governor, the Augustal prefect, an order to expel them from Egypt, and a military force to carry out the order, he invaded Nitria by night. The scene which followed must have contrasted strangely with the ordinary sights and sounds of that tranquil place—the large church with its three palm trees, the hospice and the bakehouses, the "swarms" of monks in cowl, cape, shirt, and sheepskin, the orderly variety of occupations, the profound silence broken at 3 p.m. daily by hymns, the prescribed psalmody and Scripture reading, the spiritual conversations, the Communion in church on Sunday and Saturday. Palladius says that Theophilus, on his arrival, caused Dioscorus to be dragged from his episcopal seat, plundered the monastic cells, looked in vain for the other three Brothers (who were hidden in a well), and departed, after setting the cells on fire with all that they contained—including the copies of Scripture, the reserved Sacrament "the symbols of the mysteries," and even, "as eye-witnesses asserted," a young child. His own account of his proceedings (found in the Ambrosian library at Milan) is to the effect that, having been memorialised by the orthodox monks and abbots, he convoked the bishops of the district so as nearly to make a "full" synod, and visited Nitria. "Fathers" assembled from nearly all Egypt; Origen's book "On Principles" was read, and

excited general horror ("we stopped our ears"): he and his disciples were condemned: but some Origenist monks gathered a band of poor men and slaves, and, after the archbishop returned to Alexandria, endeavoured to raise a tumult against him, professedly in the cause of Isidore. Their outcries were calculated to exasperate the pagans to some act of violent revenge for the destruction of Alexandrian idolatry: the object, in fact, was to prevent the bishops from trying Isidore, who, when formally accused of a grave crime, had recourse to evasions and bribery. Referring to the "heresy of Origen," and specifying parts of it as signally offensive, Theophilus adds, "For these and many other errors they have been condemned and excommunicated." He also asserts that the Tall Brothers, after their condemnation, forcibly kept possession of the monastic church at Nitria—holding out "clubs wrapt in palm branches" as deceitful symbols of peace—and that they were only constrained by the indignation of the well-affected monks to "allow the service to be performed, and the Church's rights to be upheld." This, of course he means, happened after the Nitrian synod's formal sitting and judgment. Here, then, is a striking conflict of assertions; but some few facts are undisputed—that, in some way or other, the Nitrian monks were obnoxious to Theophilus as friends of Isidore, no less than as so-called Origenists; that Theophilus officially occupied their mountain, where they were promptly excommunicated by a "synod;" that Nitria, thus cleared of its "Origenist" inmates, was ere long filled with monks of whom Theophilus could say, as he soon afterwards wrote to Jerome, that they were amenable to discipline and had no sympathy with heresy of any sort.

This expulsion of the Tall Brothers happened, apparently, in August 401, or perhaps a little earlier. They fled to Palestine, followed by a great number of Nitrian monks and clerics; and the letter of Theophilus just quoted is addressed to the bishops of Palestine—then assembled for the September Dedication festival at Jerusalem—and of Cyprus. The bishops at Jerusalem promised Theophilus not to receive any of those whom he had condemned for heresy; and one, the bishop of Lydda, wrote him a special letter of encouragement. Jerome had heard of Theophilus's performances through two "brethren" from Alexandria, who were commissioned to "pursue" the fugitive Nitrians; but he received, ere long, a letter in which Theophilus, writing briefly but in a friendly tone, announced the restoration, as he called it, of peace

to the Church of Egypt, and alluded with some soreness to the fact that in Palestine some would sympathize with the condemned Origenizers, or, in his own phrase, would be trying to subvert the truth. Jerome replied in a half-patronising tone, congratulating Theophilus on having at last acted decisively. To Epiphanius also, zealous as of old, the Alexandrian bishop could look for thoroughgoing co-operation: but he was made to feel in other quarters that his violent measures had given offence. He found it desirable to write to some monks who complained loudly of the condemnation of Origenism; and he lavished civilities in vain on Posthumianus of Gaul, the friend of Sulpicius, who visited Alexandria during the "agitations" of this controversy, and was better received than he had expected, but declined to stay long in an atmosphere of persecution, where a "cruel precedent" had been set.

And the persecuted Nitrians—what was their position? After visiting Jerusalem, most of them settled for a brief space at Scythopolis, the representative of the ancient Bethshan, lying on the sides of Mount Gilboa, where the palm-trees would be serviceable for their usual handicraft. One can well imagine how they tried to recall amid far different scenes the old tranquil life of Nitria; but also, how, being good men, experienced in suffering, and trained to that unearthly calmness which is so striking a feature in the old monastic ideal, they sat quietly at their basket-work, and rose up regularly for prayer, maintaining, as far as might be, their old devotional habits. But their prospects, humanly speaking, were dark enough. They had been scandalously ill-used; for they had been treated as heretics and outcasts, without any proof that they personally accepted the unsound elements of Origenian speculation, that they were less than loyal to Nicene orthodoxy, that they Platonized on the nature of the soul or on the work of redemption, that they were Idealists or Universalists. This was assumed, and they were to be dealt with as if convicted, wherever the influence of Theophilus might extend. Able, resolute, unscrupulous, the occupant of the great "Evangelical throne" had been all the bitterer against them because they had read his character; his Roman brother, the chief of bishops, would believe the worst that he might say of them; Jerome, the most powerful of monks, and Epiphanius, the most erudite of prelates, would think it a duty to pursue them with anathemas that would ring over half the world. Even persons like Paul, an exiled Egyptian bishop

who had formerly been persecuted by Theophilus, held sternly aloof from men suspected of Origenism; and their old friend Rufinus, who, years before, had been welcomed at Nitria with such genial kindness, and had declared that "nowhere else had he found charity so flourishing," was not indeed silenced as a controversialist, nor put formally under Church-ban, nor deprived of a considerable following, but still was, ecclesiastically, in a position of great disadvantage, and unable to help the victims of ecclesiastical absolutism and injustice. The Brothers were not, it is true, without friends in the Syrian episcopate; Theophilus wrote a peremptory letter to some bishops—Palladius says of Palestine, and in that case they must presumably have been prelates who had not joined with their brethren in the festival at Jerusalem and thereby pledged him their support—"You ought not to have received these men against my wish, but since you were acting ignorantly, I hold you excused: only take care, for the future, not to receive them to any position, as ecclesiastics or as laymen." Thus hunted from place to place, the Nitrians took the only course left open to them. They determined to seek redress at Constantinople.

Here, then, it is that one current of the Origenistic controversy flows suddenly and strongly, and with momentous consequences, into the stream of Chrysostom's episcopate. It was at a crisis in his life, as we have already seen, that he was thus brought into connexion with men whom Theophilus had persecuted, and so into collision with Theophilus himself, who already, and independently of this occurrence, bore him a grudge for being bishop of Constantinople. We may suppose that the ultimate hope of the Brothers was to get a hearing from Arcadius: but they were, at any rate, most desirous of making an impression on a prelate so well known for his fearless uprightness, and so capable, from force of character and high position in the hierarchy, of remonstrating effectively with their own "Pope," as was the famous "bishop John." This, then, is the scene before us. Towards the end of 401, fifty aged men asked admission to Chrysostom's presence, and threw themselves as suppliants at his feet. He stood still, in pity and amazement; then, with tears, asked who had done them wrong. "Sit down, father," was the answer, "and provide some remedy for the harm that Pope Theophilus has inflicted on us. If, out of regard for him, you will not act, we shall be obliged to apply to the Emperor. But we beg you to induce Theophilus to let us live

in Egypt, in our own home ; for we have not offended against him, or against the law of our Saviour." Chrysostom promised to do his best. "Meanwhile," he said, "until I have written to my brother Theophilus, keep silence here about the business that has brought you to Constantinople." He assigned them a lodging in the precinct of the church called Anastasia, where still lingered, so to speak, the memories of Gregory's revival-work in the cause of the Catholic faith—work which had itself been troubled and arrested by the temporary unfriendliness of Alexandria. The exiles were supported, not by Chrysostom, but by pious ladies of his flock, over and above the proceeds of their own handicraft, which they carried on in Constantinople as in Palestine. They might attend the church service, but, pending inquiries, they were not admitted to Communion, and thus were placed in the position of the highest class of penitents called "Consistentes" or those who stood in prayer with the faithful. Herein Chrysostom followed the advice of some Alexandrian clerics who had been sent on other business to the court, and who candidly admitted that the Nitrian monks had been hardly treated—suggesting also that Chrysostom should show them all episcopal kindness short of full Church fellowship.

Chrysostom then proceeded to write to Theophilus : "Oblige me, your son and brother, by being reconciled to these men." Theophilus, as we learn from his own correspondence, was indignant that the Nitrians should have found any reception in the Eastern capital ; he promptly despatched the five monks whom, says Palladius, he had suborned to bear witness against them, and who now, on reaching Constantinople, made such good use of the documents furnished them by Theophilus, that the Brothers and their companions, if they ever appeared within the palace gates, "were pointed out as magicians who might cast a glamour on Chrysostom or on Arcadius." They now resolved to address their "Pope" himself, and "sent many intercessors to him," protesting that "they anathematized all false doctrine ;" they also, somewhat inconsistently as we may think, presented to Chrysostom a formal statement containing many grave charges against Theophilus, some of which Palladius forbears to mention lest he should be disbelieved, but which for the most part related to tyranny.

Again Chrysostom wrote, and now with greater urgency, to Theophilus, intimating that the Nitrians were now so embittered that they had drawn up accusations against him—a step which he

for his part had regretted, exhorting them to avoid what would but aggravate the mischief. "Write in reply," he continued, "what you think. For these men do not listen to my advice to withdraw from the court." Theophilus only wanted an excuse to pick a quarrel, and instantly construed this friendly letter as an attempt to usurp jurisdiction over his see. "I suppose," he replied, "you are aware of the Nicene Canons, forbidding a bishop to judge cases that arise beyond his own bounds; if you are not, inform yourself of them, and keep clear of indictments against me. If I *am* to be tried, it must be by Egyptian bishops, not by you, who live seventy-five days' journey distant from me." Chrysostom read this letter privately, and then tried to persuade the Nitrians, and the five monks who had been sent to denounce them, that it would be better to let the matter drop. This advice naturally displeased both parties. The Nitrians thought that he was abandoning them to be trampled on by tyranny; their opponents had no instructions from Theophilus warranting them to come to terms. Indeed, Theophilus had no thought of peace; he saw his way, he believed, to a more complete victory over "Origenism," and also, beyond, to the humiliation of Chrysostom. He had already opened negotiations with Epiphanius, whom in former days he had scorned and denounced (unfairly, we must remember) as a superstitious Anthropomorphite. The latter was highly exultant when he received from such a proselyte to anti-Origenist orthodoxy a request to assemble the Cypriot bishops, to condemn Origenism in synod, to signify the condemnatory sentence to Theophilus himself, to the bishop of Constantinople, and to any other bishops; to send trusty agents to Constantinople, and to warn the Isaurian and Pamphylian bishops against the intrigues of the Origenist exiles; lastly, to pray "that in this strife also we may win the victory." Epiphanius, whom Professor Bury likens to an old war-horse eager for battle, was only too glad to comply. He wrote to Jerome, describing Theophilus's proceedings in language drawn from the defeat of Amalek in Rephidim. He held a Council of the twelve bishops of his island church—which claimed to be independent of Antioch—in 402, and procured a resolution condemnatory of Origenism, whereby the faithful of Cyprus were forbidden to read Origen's works.

But the matter of the Tall Brothers was now in such a stage as to give Theophilus cause for grave anxiety. Chrysostom had seen the case pass out of his hands; the Nitrians were bent on

pushing it before the imperial tribunal. They gave in their paper of charges against Theophilus—charges which, says Palladius, precisely answered to his conduct—and also their complaint against his monks as calumniators, for the consideration of the Emperor; and in church they requested the Empress to procure a formal hearing of both sides before the “prefects,” and—what was more, and too much—to let Theophilus be brought to Constantinople and tried by its bishop. Thereupon an officer called Elaphius was despatched to Alexandria, the monks who accused the Brothers were examined, their statements found baseless, and their lives declared forfeit. “The laws,” says Palladius, “pressed on them with the glitter of the sword.” They begged a reprieve until Theophilus could appear to support them: and were thrown into prison, where some of them died.

Such was the position of matters at the beginning of 403. Chrysostom was attending to his own work, caring little for anything else by comparison with it: he received, but disregarded, Epiphanius's exhortation to condemn Origenism in synod, after the precedents of Alexandria and Cyprus: as Tillemont says, he thought only of nourishing his people with the word of truth, not of troubling them with disputes, and he equally neglected the intrigues which, as he must in part have known, were being formed, under Theophilus's prompting and that of others, against his own position and authority. Suddenly, in obedience to a suggestion of Theophilus, Epiphanius, then more than eighty years old, landed at Hebdomon, a suburb of Constantinople. He was by this time deeply prejudiced against Chrysostom, and quite disposed to be an instrument in the hands of the bishop of Alexandria for humbling an overweening and Origenizing Court-prelate. He began by officiating in the church of St. John the Baptist at Hebdomon, and irregularly ordaining a deacon: he then went on to the city, was respectfully met by a procession of the clergy, but refused Chrysostom's offer of lodging in the episcopal house; he took up his abode in a private house, declined all conversation with the bishop, but gathered round him the bishops then at Constantinople, showed them the decree of his own Synod, and asked them to do as he and his brethren had done. “Theophilus and I have thought good to forbid the reading of Origen.” Some, out of respect for the old man and his high reputation, consented: many declined, especially the good Theotimus, bishop of Tomi. “For my part,” he said, “I

do not choose to insult one who died a noble death long ago, nor injuriously to proscribe what our predecessors did not condemn." He went so far, if we can trust Socrates, as to utter the paradox, "Nor is there any bad doctrine in Origen:" but probably this is an exaggeration founded on his reading aloud to the meeting one of Origen's passages which was undeniably orthodox. "If you condemn that," he added, "you condemn the Scripture on which it comments." Chrysostom, instead of being offended with Epiphanius for ordaining within his diocese without his sanction, continued to offer him civilities. Epiphanius refused to meet him in church, or to stay in his house until he expelled the Tall Brothers and signed the decree against Origen's books. Chrysostom replied that he must wait until a full church assembly had examined the question. His adversaries then persuaded Epiphanius that he could do good service by openly denouncing the Brothers, and Chrysostom as their patron, and also the works of Origen, at the next day's service in the Apostles' Church. Epiphanius was entering the church for that purpose, when the arch-deacon Sarapion brought him a message from Chrysostom, remonstrating on the irregularity and capriciousness of this conduct, and intimating that he would do well to abstain from what might excite the people and bring his own person into danger. Epiphanius was alarmed, and left the church: he tried to overawe the Empress by telling her that her sick boy, afterwards Theodosius II., would recover if she would discountenance the Nitrian "heretics:" Eudoxia answered with dignity, that she left her son's case to the Divine will. She caused the Brothers to visit Epiphanius. "Who are you?" he asked. "The Tall ones, father," answered Ammonius: "pray tell me, have you ever come across disciples or writings of ours?" He had not. "How then do you know that we are heretics?" "I heard so." "We have treated you very differently: we have often met your disciples, read your books, especially 'The Anchored One,' upheld your orthodoxy: whereas you have condemned us on merest hearsay." Epiphanius, impressed by this, and perhaps disgusted by the partisan intrigues which he found at work, spoke to them more kindly, and soon afterwards sailed for Cyprus. In bidding farewell to some prelates who escorted him to the vessel, he significantly intimated that they were "acting in a play:" the report that he had also predicted

his own speedy death would easily be suggested by his great age. He died, in fact, at sea,—probably on May 12, the day on which he is honoured alike by Eastern and Western Churches. His life reads a serious lesson to theological controversialists, and his narrowness, bigotry, and egotistic self-confidence illustrate the process by which “orthodoxy” has too often got itself a bad name.

And now, at length, the great enemy alike of the Tall Brothers and of Chrysostom appeared upon the stage. Theophilus had presumed on his great place by being in no hurry to obey the Imperial summons. When he left Alexandria, and also when he passed through Lycia, he is said to have declared, “I am going off to the Court to depose John.” He spoke with more warrant than was imagined, perhaps, by some who heard him. For it so happened that, just after Epiphanius’s departure, Eudoxia had taken offence at some sharp words in a sermon of Chrysostom’s directed against the faults of worldly women—words which, so she was told, were aimed at none other than herself. She complained to Arcadius, and both were on this account alienated from “John,” and ready to favour Theophilus in his hostility, whatever form it might take. Theophilus had also received pressing letters from several ecclesiastics who hated Chrysostom; and he well knew that he could reckon on some episcopal instruments, in this business as in others. Accordingly, authorised by an Imperial order to hold a council, he arrived at Chalcedon accompanied by a train of obsequious suffragans, and was welcomed by the local bishop Cyrinus, a hot-tempered Egyptian, and by other prelates who had grievances against Chrysostom, such as those whom he had deposed two years before at Ephesus. Thither, doubtless, came Severian, with the old, sore feeling strong as ever, and Antiochus of Ptolemais, and Acacius of Beroea, who, as we have seen, had been disgusted at finding himself unprovided with good lodgings in the city, and laid the blame on Chrysostom’s want of courtesy. Chalcedon, in fact, became a muster-place of malcontents and plotters: and Cyrinus harangued them on the offences of Chrysostom, “that irreligious, arrogant, unbending prelate.” Arrangements having been made as to the plan of action, Theophilus proceeded to Constantinople. It was midday on a Thursday in June when he disembarked, amid the cheers of Egyptian sailors attached to the corn-ships, but without the usual greetings from the clergy. He would not enter the Great Church, but occupied a house belonging

to the princesses of the Imperial family, and known as the Lodgings of Placidia. In spite of repeated messages, he persisted in refusing to meet Chrysostom, and sat in his distant lodgings organizing his plan of attack on the bishop of Constantinople, while the latter refused, on grounds of Church order, to assume the office of judging a foreign bishop. The Emperor urged Chrysostom to hear the cause, but he positively declined to do so. Theophilus had no such scruples on his side; he is said to have bribed largely, given costly entertainments, held out hopes of Church promotion, used all means to secure influence, and speedily persuaded the two deacons who had been deposed by Chrysostom for their crimes of adultery and homicide to furnish written charges, suggested by himself, against their bishop. Then, as having done enough in the way of "adding fresh animosities to old ones," and being ready for direct action, he held a conference at the house of a malcontent lady—one of the three widows whose pride Chrysostom had mortified by his rebukes; to this appropriate rendezvous of malignant intriguers came Severian, Antiochus, Acacius, and others like-minded, and, by the advice of one of them, it was resolved formally to present charges against Chrysostom to the Emperor, and thus enforce his attendance, as an accused person, before a synod or court of bishops. On this a further question arose—"Where should they hold their synod?" Chalcedon had already been found a convenient meeting-place: and Cyrinus, doubtless, it was who suggested that near Chalcedon, and sufficiently remote from the great capital in which Chrysostom had still so many friends and adherents, was a suburban church of SS. Peter and Paul, with a monastery founded by the Prefect Rufinus in his days of greatness and selected as the place of his baptism, where the senator Arsenius, afterwards famous for his retreat to monastic life at Scetis, had acted as the neophyte's godfather. This suburb was locally known as "The Oak," and it was now to acquire under that name a most disgraceful celebrity.

Here, then, Theophilus and the bishops of his party assembled as in Synod. Three weeks had elapsed since his arrival at Constantinople: it was now probably about the first or second week in July, supposing that he did not arrive until some time after the departure of Epiphanius. The number of prelates who met at the Oak is variously given as thirty-six and forty-five. Theophilus naturally presided. The chief accusers of Chrysostom were John, one of the deposed deacons, and a bishop named Isaac: and we

are told by Chrysostom himself that Theophilus authoritatively summoned the archdeacon of Constantinople, in order to procure by his means the attendance and evidence of other clergy.

The bishops sent to summon Chrysostom. He was sitting, Palladius tells us, in the triclinium of the episcopal palace, with forty bishops, of whom Palladius himself was one. "We were all amazed that Theophilus, who had been commanded to repair alone to the Court, as an accused person, had come with so many bishops—and had so utterly changed the opinions of men in power, and perverted the majority of the clergy." Rumours of the most extreme measures were already current. Chrysostom tried to cheer his brethren. "Pray, my brethren! and do not, if you love Christ, leave your own churches on my account." He quoted the apostle's words, "I am now ready to be offered," and foretold that he should suffer much, and then die; entreating their prayers until some wept, and others by way of farewell began kissing the bishop's eyes and head and lips. Then, while they were indecisively moving to and fro, and had not actually gone out, he bade them sit down and not break his heart. Still using the language of St. Paul, he repeated the text, "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." He reminded them of his frequent exhortations as to the transitory character of life. "This present life is a journey, and its good and its pain are transient: the present world is a fair—we have bought, have sold, and are going our way." "Are we better than the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, that we should be immortal in this world?" One bishop, with a loud outcry of irrepressible grief, spoke of their too probable "orphanhood," of the widowhood which would befall the Church of Constantinople, of the subversion of Church laws, the ascendancy of worldly and ambitious men, the helpless condition of the poor, the failure of preaching, which drew from the bishop the characteristic words, "Enough, my brother! I repeat, Do not leave your churches. The power of preaching did not begin with me, and will not end with me. When Moses died, Joshua was raised up in his place: David succeeded to Samuel, Baruch to Jeremiah, Elisha to Elijah; when Paul was beheaded, did he not leave behind Timothy, Titus, Apollos, and many more?" "But," said Eulysius of Apamea, "if we keep our churches, they will force us to communicate with them, and to subscribe the decree which they may pass against you." "Communicate," said Chrysostom, "in order to avoid a schism; but do not subscribe, for I am not conscious" (using a

well-known Pauline phrase) "of having so much as entertained any thought meriting deposition." Just then it was announced that messengers had come from Theophilus. "Let them come in," said Chrysostom. Two young Lybian prelates entered, named Dioscorus and Paul. He asked what was their rank in the Church. Finding that they were bishops, he begged them to sit down, and state their business. "We have only a document: cause it to be read." "Let it be read," said Chrysostom. They told Theophilus's servant-boy, whom they had brought with them, to read it. "The Holy Council assembled at the Oak, to John,"—ignoring his title of bishop. "We have received accusations against you, by which you are charged with a multitude of crimes. Come, then, and meet us, bringing with you Sarapion and Tigrius, the presbyters: for we need their presence." A deputation was sent back—consisting of three bishops, Lupicinus, Demetrius, and Eulysius, and two priests, Germanus and Severus—to warn Theophilus against violating Nicene law by intrusive proceedings in another province; to protest against his open contempt of judicial fairness; and to claim, on behalf of the bishops at Constantinople, superior synodical authority in comparison with the bishops—fewer in number, it was asserted—at the Oak. To this message Chrysostom, for himself, added another, part of which is embodied in the acts of the hostile council: "Remove from the ranks of my judges those who are avowedly my foes, and I am ready to appear and defend myself either before you or before any synod on earth; if you will not do this, you may cite me as often as you please, but you will make nothing by it." Sozomen says that he offered to appear before a larger council, if he might first learn the names of his accusers and inspect the accusation, but he would not submit to any unreasonable sentence or accept avowed enemies as his judges. He expressly challenged four persons—Theophilus, Severian, Acacius, and Antiochus—as disqualified for trying his cause by notorious personal hostility. The biographer adds, and Sozomen repeats the statement, that an Imperial notary next appeared, with an order referring to the petition of the hostile bishops that he might be compelled to appear, and commanding him to appear accordingly. When he "gave his answer," two of his own priests, Eugenius and the monk Isaac, brought another summons, to which an answer was made, "How can you judge me, who have not excluded my enemies and have cited me by my own clerics?" The bearers

of this reply were seized and violently ill used. One was beaten : another had his dress torn : another had chains put round his neck. The record implies, and Sozomen asserts, that he was four times cited.

The first list of charges, given in by John the deacon, amounted to twenty-nine. In these the personal attack on Chrysostom shelved every other topic : there was no mention of the Origenistic controversy, nor of the Tall Brothers, save that the nineteenth article had reference to the treatment of the five monks, who, as we have seen, had been convicted of calumny and thrown into prison ; when some of them died there, said the accusers, he had deprived them of burial. The charges now made may be divided into—

(1) Imputations on Chrysostom's official and administrative conduct : as that he suspended John the deacon (the accuser) from communion merely because he struck his own slave Eulalius (1st charge) ; he caused a monk named John to be beaten, and put in chains among demoniacs (2nd) ; he accused three deacons publicly of theft (9th) ; he caused faithful Catholics to be imprisoned, and deprived them when dead of burial (19th) ; he gave over two priests to Eutropius for exile (21st, 22nd) ; he made unfit persons bishops or priests (10th, 18th) ; he gave money to those whom he ordained, in order to make them his instruments in oppressing the clergy (29th) ; he acted as accuser, witness, and judge (26th) ; he sold Church property (3rd), many ornaments and marbles left by Nectarius for the Anastasia (4th), and a piece of property left by one Thecla (16th) ; he took away Church funds, and no one knew what had become of them (17th) ; he held some ordinations apart from the altar (*i.e.* apparently not in church) (13th) ; he had ordained four bishops at one time (14th) ; he ordained many persons without testimony (24th).

(2) Imputations on his personal conduct, divisible into three heads—

(a) Charges against his temper, etc., as that he spoke very harshly of Epiphanius, and of clerics (6th and 5th) ; he wrote a book of false charges against clergy (8th) ; he insulted Acacius and would not speak to him (20th) ; he struck Memnon at the Apostles' Church, and then " offered the mysteries " (27th) ; he was wont to have the bath heated for himself only, and then closed by Sarapion against every one else (23rd) ; he took his meals alone, and intemperately, like the Cyclops (25th : this implied the charge of being unsocial).

(b) Against his habits in regard to religion: he did not pray on entering or leaving church (12th); while on his throne, he took off or put on his robes, and ate lozenges (28th: this charge implies the use of peculiar vestments for the Eucharist: as to the lozenges, or, perhaps, bread wafers (*pastilli*), it was true that he advised all persons, after communicating, to take one, or to drink water).

(c) Against his morality: he had private interviews with women (15th: this, as Chrysostom was informed, implied or was developed into a charge of actual immorality).

The "Council at the Oak," after examining the first two of these charges (relating to John the deacon's own grievance and to the imprisonment of the monk John), began to inquire into accusations preferred against Heraclides, who had become bishop of Ephesus under Chrysostom's auspices, and Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis. At this point of the affair the question of Origenism reappeared; John the monk both denounced Heraclides as an Origenizer, and complained that he himself had been oppressed by Chrysostom in the Origenizing interest. After these charges had been considered, the council recurred to two more of John the deacon's—those relating to the accusation of the three deacons, and to the alleged outrage on Memnon—and then the third accuser, bishop Isaac, first denounced Heraclides as an Origenizer and as having refused to eat or drink with Epiphanius, and then handed in a paper containing seventeen supplementary charges against Chrysostom. In these the imputation of Origenizing sympathies was prominent. The others referred—

(1) To Chrysostom's language in church: some words spoken in high religious excitement were adduced as, at any rate, "needing explanation." He was also accused of having blasphemously said that Christ's prayer was not heard because not made aright. But especial stress apparently was laid on his having said, "If you have sinned again, repent: as often as you sin, come to me, and I will heal you." This, it was urged, was a distinct encouragement to laxity.

(2) To his conduct as a Church ruler—as that he had invaded other bishops' dioceses, ignored the rights of the clergy by ordaining without their presence and consent, treated bishops with insolence, put strange affronts on clergy, patronized pagans who were bitterly hostile to Christians, made men bishops who were still slaves, seized by force deposits belonging to others, maltreated

Isaac, the accuser, many times; moreover, that he had been stirring up the people against the synod then sitting. And we must include, it seems, in this list the charge of having alluded to the Empress under the name of Jezebel.

(3) His personal habits were denounced as unsocial: "He disregards the duty of hospitality, by taking his meals alone."

Two other charges, not mentioned by the framer of the council Acts, are dwelt upon with much emphasis by Chrysostom: "It is said that I have given communion to several persons who were not fasting. If I have done this, let my name be blotted out of the roll of bishops, and not written in the book of the orthodox faith, . . . and Christ shall cast me out of His kingdom." Again he was charged with having baptized after he had eaten. "But," he proceeds, "if they urge this contentiously, let them depose Paul who baptized a whole household after supper, yea, the Lord Himself, who after supper gave communion to His apostles." In regard to these matters, we must observe that baptism was ordinarily administered at the end of a most solemn fast day, Easter Eve; and that the Church rule as to fasting communion, so strongly pressed by the great Fathers, is regarded by Chrysostom as strictly binding on his conscience, as not to be broken without sin, yet as differing in its own nature from a moral law or an express command of Christ.

To return to the Council of the Oak. After the second list of charges was given in, two of them were specially examined—one relating to Epiphanius's reason for not communicating with Chrysostom, and the other relating to Chrysostom's alleged teaching on the prayer of Christ. After these the council took up the third in the first list, which referred to the sale of Church furniture, as to which three presbyters gave evidence, two of whom were afterwards placed in Chrysostom's see. On the fourth in that list, the sale of the marbles, the same witnesses spoke, and a fourth presbyter with them. They then, with two others, pressed the council to give judgment. Paul, bishop of Heraclea, who as metropolitan over Constantinople was jealous of its bishop, was the first to say that it was time to take this step. The bishops thereupon, beginning with Gymnasius and ending with Theophilus, voted the deposition of Chrysostom—apparently towards the end of the thirteen days or more which are to be assigned for the duration of this disgraceful synod. Formal notice of its decision was sent to the clergy of Constantinople, and also to the Emperor,

who was informed that "John, accused and refusing to plead, had thereby shown a guilty conscience, and had incurred deposition"—and further, that among the charges against him was that of treason (meaning that he had been accused of describing Eudoxia as Jezebel), which must be left to the Imperial cognizance. The council also received complaints, apparently after the sentence had been passed, from three bishops whom Chrysostom had deposed, but took no further steps in their case. One more sitting—the thirteenth, as Photius tells us—was occupied with the condemnation of Heraclides of Ephesus. And thus the work being done for which Theophilus had made such preparations, he thought fit to extend his favour to the persecuted "Origenists" of Nitria, who therefore were exhorted by the bishops to ask his pardon, and as nothing was more ordinary than for monks, even when injured, to go through the form of asking pardon, they humbled themselves thus far to their pope, and were solemnly restored to the privileges of his communion. "I do not think," says Sozomen, "that this would have happened," if all four Brothers had been alive and acting together. But Dioscorus was dead, and Ammonius was dying; and the other two were men of inferior mark, although in themselves both good and able. Thus ended the Council of the Oak.

But we must look back a little to see the immediate results of its sentence against Chrysostom. The same evening had brought the news over to Constantinople: the people were violently incensed, and forthwith kept watch around the Great Church all night, to prevent their bishop from being carried away. At daybreak they loudly demanded another and a larger synod, and persevered for two days in thus testifying their affection for Chrysostom. On the second day he preached a sermon beginning "Many are the billows and terrible is the storm, but we fear not. . . . for we stand upon the Rock," and exhorted his hearers to have faith in the vitality of the Church, citing his favourite texts, "To me to live is Christ," and "The earth is the Lord's," and "We brought nothing into the world." Probably, too, he preached a second sermon in which he cited Job's words, "Blessed be the Name of the Lord"—a sermon in which that saying is emphasized does occur in his works as the second discourse before his exile; in it he is made to say, "They are about to depose me because I spread out no carpets, and wore no silken garments, and did not pamper their gluttony nor supply them with gold and silver." Arcadius,

passing by the charge of treason, in the end confirmed the ecclesiastical sentence, ordering Chrysostom to be removed from his church and carried into exile: and on the third day about noon the bishop privately surrendered himself to the Imperial officers, in order to prevent a tumult which might be the ground of further accusations. And thus, as the summer evening advanced, Constantinople saw its pastor conducted as a State prisoner by a "curiosus," or Imperial agent, to be put on board ship; and the next morning found him on the coast of Bithynia.

Thereupon the whole heart of the city was moved with sympathy and indignation. When Theophilus, that day, appeared in the cathedral with an armed following and hoped to overawe the people into accepting as bishop a man whom he had selected, and whose appointment he intended to carry out in due form, he found that he had undertaken too much. The people were resolutely loyal to Chrysostom. A sermon by Severian, to the effect that, if John had been condemned for nothing else, his pride alone would have merited this punishment, was heard with disgust and followed by loud outcries against the preacher and also against the Alexandrian bishop, whose change of front as to the Brothers was deemed self-condemnatory. Orders were given to clear the church: the "satellites" of Theophilus used their clubs, and blood was spilt on the floor of the baptistery. Forthwith arose a wild universal outcry, ringing through the streets, thundering at the gates of the palace, "Give us back our bishop!" With the demands of the more vehement spirits were mingled the loud prayers and lamentations of ardently devout souls, entreating Divine aid for a city bereft of its pastor: and we are told that some persons external to the Church were deeply impressed by the aspect of the city on that memorable afternoon. In the evening a shock as of an earthquake, felt in the Imperial apartments as well as in the streets, frightened the Empress into repentance for her part in the attack upon Chrysostom. That very night she sent him a letter, "Let not your Holiness think that I was a party to what has been done. Wicked and unprincipled men devised this plot. My sorrow, God knows, is sincere." She readily persuaded her husband to recall the bishop; and Briso her chamberlain was sent to find and bring him back. It was not known at Constantinople where he was just then to be found; but Briso presently discovered him at a town called Prænetus, near Nicomedia, and conducted him

across the Bosphorus, which was crowded with vessels full of people awaiting his return. He stopped for a while at Marianæ, a house belonging to the Empress, in the Anaplus quarter, some three leagues from the capital; refusing to come further until a fuller synod than that of the Oak should have cancelled his deposition.

But the people would brook no delay. They murmured angrily against the Emperor and Empress: and Chrysostom was morally constrained to proceed to Constantinople, escorted by thirty bishops, and met by enthusiastic crowds singing hymns composed for the occasion and for the most part carrying lighted tapers, the usual token of triumphant joy. Thus he re-entered the Apostles' Church. At the gate his scruples as to his canonical position re-asserted themselves. "This must be done by virtue of a judicial sentence; the existing sentence must be rescinded." But the people insisted, and he passed onward, upward into the sanctuary, took his old place on the throne, and his people's "ardent desire" to hear his voice again, as of old, was gratified. He pronounced the familiar benediction, "Peace be to you all!" One can imagine the thundering response, "And with thy spirit!" And then he preached, extempore, a short sermon, beginning, "What shall I say or speak? 'Blessed be God!' This I said when I went away: this I again repeat—or rather, when I was away, I never ceased to say it." He bade them remember how he had dwelt on Job's words, "Blessed be the Name of the Lord:" exhorted them to bless God alike in trouble and in gladness: adverted to the religious earnestness which recent troubles had called out, to the affection and attachment which were now shown him even by Jews and others formerly alien from the Church and the bishop: and with significant exultation remarked that, for once, a Church gathering had emptied the seats at the Circus. He concluded by a reference to the relics honoured in that church, and to the difference, on that day, between his happy situation and the toils and sufferings of apostles. On that evening he had a message from Eudoxia: "My prayer has been fulfilled. It is worth more than the diadem to have regained my bishop!" Next day he preached a longer sermon, beginning with a comparison, in very strange taste, between Theophilus and the Pharaoh who took away Sarah from Abraham. This discourse contains also a panegyric, of what one might call a fulsome sort, on Eudoxia, as to whom he would now naturally endeavour to believe and hope the best. The other remarkable points in the sermon are the description of

Theophilus's invasion of the cathedral, the vivid picture of mothers holding their little ones and thronging the water-edge as he disembarked, and the mention of the flight of some faithless and shame-stricken clerics, who had turned against their chief, and had now "decamped when none pursued."

But amid all this joy he kept steadily in mind his object—the regular and synodical abrogation of the proceedings of the synod of the Oak, and his own reinstatement by unimpeachable Church authority. The example of St. Athanasius, who had been much hampered by the want of such a reinstatement after his return from his first exile, was before him; and he induced Arcadius to issue citations for a new synod. Upon this, as Chrysostom himself tells the story, "Theophilus, as one self-convicted and fearing exposure, secretly, at midnight, put himself on board a vessel, and fled away with his adherents," including the calumnious monk Isaac. Very few of the hostile bishops ventured to remain at Constantinople; two, however, left only to return in a short time with renewed plans of hostility—Severian and Antiochus. It appears that sixty-five bishops, by communicating with Chrysostom, testified their contempt for—it may be, in some cases, their regret for having sanctioned—the proceedings of the hostile council. But this was not a synodical act: it could not, therefore, content him, and he continued to press for the holding of another council. Theophilus, in fact, was cited to attend, but he excused himself on the ground of popular excitement. So passed away two months, which Palladius describes as "a breathing-time from affliction:" but the second period of Chrysostom's troubles must be reserved for another chapter.

CHAPTER XXX.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S LATER TROUBLES.

WHATEVER hopes might be entertained, at the time of Chrysostom's recall, as to a good understanding for the future between the court and the bishop of Constantinople were thoroughly blighted during the autumn of this same year. He had found that Arcadius became lukewarm in respect of the new Council and the fresh inquiry which he demanded with so much earnestness. The Emperor, always dull and languid, was accustomed to be ruled by his clever wife: she had, no doubt, expressed in almost hyperbolical terms her satisfaction at regaining her pastor; but when Chrysostom with a strange excess of courtliness expressed in return his confidence in her goodness, he must have had, to say the least, considerable misgivings, and he was now to find them justified to the full. It was apparently about the end of September, 403, when the people of Constantinople were invited to admire a silver statue of the Empress, which was being erected in the Augustæum on a lofty pillar of porphyry in front of the senate-house and on the south-west of the cathedral. The beautiful Frankish princess was represented as wearing a long robe, and doubtless as adorned with imperial insignia. As was usual at the inauguration of imperial statues—which, according to the notions of that time, were so closely associated with the very personality of the originals—there was much noisy applause, and much display of “dancers and mimes,” within “half the breadth of a street” from the very gates of St. Sophia. Now we must remember that these exhibitions, in the form in which they then existed and excited popular interest in Constantinople, stirred up in the breast of such a man as Chrysostom not simple contempt or disapproval, but vivid hatred. To him, who well knew them to be centres of moral pestilence, who distinctly believed them to be, in the fullest

sense, "works of the devil," who had so earnestly, so passionately striven to guard his people against their foul attractions, it was beyond words horrifying and exasperating to find them brought so near to the house of God. It might, indeed, have been expected that, in the first instance, he would have asked the Emperor to consider the unseemliness of their juxtaposition with the cathedral, as Socrates evidently thought he might have done. But Socrates did not well understand such a soul as Chrysostom's, and the bishop, as the "fire kindled" within him, "spake with his tongue" in church, and thereby gave umbrage at court. Eudoxia took special offence, and accordingly, says Socrates, "began to devise means for assembling another Council against him." Chrysostom, he adds, became aware of this intention, and thereupon "delivered in the church that celebrated sermon beginning, 'Again Herodias is raging, again she is excited, again she is dancing, again she is seeking to obtain the head of John.'" The sermon now extant which has this beginning (on "the beheading of St. John the Baptist") is unquestionably spurious, and Gibbon thinks that the sentence may perhaps have been invented: but Chrysostom may very probably have uttered some allusion to the daughter of Herodias as the prototype of the dancers against whom he was preaching; and considering his liability to impassioned declamation in moments of zealous wrath, it is possible, and, if he did name the Baptist, it seems only too certain, that in the irritation caused by the affair of the silver statue and enhanced by what he had just learned about Eudoxia's new schemes, he meant the sentence to point at one whom he knew thenceforward to be his enemy.

To do so was to play her game, to give her "occasion," to precipitate a crisis: she was now more than ever a sure resource to Chrysostom's opponents, and they sent to Theophilus, desiring him either to return personally to Constantinople or to suggest a method of opening the new campaign. Instead of coming himself, Theophilus sent three "pitiable" bishops—Paul, Pemen, and another newly ordained—putting in their hands those canons of the Antiochene Council of Dedication which had been quoted by Arianizers against the greatest of his own predecessors. "If," said the fourth of these canons, "a bishop deposed by a synod . . . shall officiate, he shall never have a hope of restitution or of synodical re-hearing, and those who adhere to him shall be cast out of the Church." The three bishops were active in collecting allies, and Chrysostom, in his own defence, assembled as many

friendly bishops as he could. Unexpectedly, after he had been vainly, as it seemed, working for the convocation of a synod which should, by its numbers and character, crush the authority of the synod of the Oak, a synod was now imminent; but there was too much reason to fear that it might prove a "Synod of the Oak" over again. It had not apparently begun its sittings when, at Christmas 403, Arcadius, under Eudoxia's dictation, declined to come to church: he could not in conscience communicate with his bishop until the accusations made at the late Council were disproved. "I am quite ready," answered Chrysostom, as Sozomen tells the story, "to defend myself." His bold frank bearing induced even the hostile bishops, such as Acacius, Leontius of Ancyra, Ammonius of Laodicea in Pisidia, Antiochus, Cyrinus, and Severian, to communicate with him; which, on their own showing, was inconsistent with the Antiochene canons.

When the proceedings of this Council of Constantinople were opened at the beginning of 404, the real character of the forty or more charges brought forward at the Oak, which Gibbon calls "frivolous or improbable," was practically exhibited before the world. The Council, or the managers of the intrigue against Chrysostom, dropped those charges—professing, apparently, that having been once condemned on those counts he could not be admitted to a second trial—and rested simply on the letter of the Antiochene canons. It was formally proposed that ten bishops of Chrysostom's party should discuss with the opposite side the question which was inevitable when those canons were adduced: Was that Council of Antioch a Catholic Council, or a non-Catholic one? Chrysostom's friends maintained the latter view, and affirmed that the fourth canon had been abrogated or set aside by the action of the Council of Sardica—which was substantially true, inasmuch as the latter Council held itself free to review the whole Athanasian case, without regard to any such Council as the Antiochene. The discussion was conducted in Arcadius's own presence. Elpidius of the Syrian Laodicea insisted that Chrysostom had returned by the Emperor's express order, and that the Antiochene Council was heretical. A war of words ensued, with little reverence for the Emperor's dignity; when there was a lull, Elpidius—an old man who had suffered under Valens for orthodoxy—said very quietly to the Emperor, "Instead of troubling your Grace at further length, let our brethren on the other side, who produce these canons, profess in writing to believe as their authors believed." Arcadius's

listless expression was brightened for once by a smile. "Nothing," he said, "can be more to the purpose." Utterly taken aback, the adverse bishops, "their faces livid with vexation," reluctantly promised to make the profession, but never in fact did so.

Weeks passed away in this vague skirmishing; Chrysostom continued to officiate, and to hold meetings with his own episcopal supporters, forty-two in number. At last, in Lent, Antiochus informed Arcadius that Chrysostom was now condemned, and must not be allowed to officiate at Easter. The feeble prince acquiesced, and sent an order to Chrysostom to "leave his church;" to which he answered, "Leave it I cannot, for I received it from God; if I go, it must be under force, for which you must be responsible." Arcadius accordingly sent some officers, who removed him from the cathedral, but allowed him to stay within his own house. Holy Week began—Holy Saturday was at hand; another order was sent, with a like reply. Arcadius, uneasy, consulted Acacius and Antiochus, who answered, "O Emperor, on our heads be the deposition of John!" The Emperor and Empress on that last day of Lent received a formal petition from the forty bishops faithful to Chrysostom, and one of these prelates took leave of Eudoxia with the significant warning, "Fear God, and pity your own children!"

The scene which followed is one of the most striking in ancient Church history. The holiest evening of the Christian year had begun; the Easter-eve services, the Scripture readings, the baptism of catechumens, were proceeding, as Chrysostom tells us, when the imperial soldiers broke into the sanctuary of the church, drove out the clergy, beset the chancel and put to flight the female postulants for baptism—not refraining from blows, which dyed the very font with blood. "Nor did the horrors end here. The soldiers penetrated to the place where the Holy Things were reserved; they looked in—some of them, as I know, being still unbaptized men; and the most holy Blood of Christ, as might well be in such a tumult, was spilt on the cloaks of the soldiers." But the scene described by Chrysostom as in a church is associated by Palladius with the Baths of Constantine, which were near the Church of the Apostles: he tells of wounds given, of the "pool" sprinkled with the blood of two old priests beaten on the head with bludgeons, of women driven away in indecorous flight, of sacrilegious insults offered to the Sacrament, if we are so to interpret the phrase "the officer in command rudely

jostled the deacon and spilt the *symbols*,"—which seems to mean that he shook the chalice, which the deacon, as usual, was holding for the communion of the new-baptized. How are we to deal with the differing accounts of localities? Assuredly Chrysostom's must be preferred to his biographer's, if one scene of outrage, and not two, is to be supposed. High authorities, indeed, would harmonize by combining—by making two distinct attacks take place, one on a church, another, at a later hour, on the baths, after vain attempts on the part of a military officer to induce the people to return to the church, so that it might not appear vacant on Easter-day. Yet although one is slow to dissent from Tillemont and Montfaucon, it seems hardly probable that this should have been the case. If only one such scene occurred, we must place it, on Chrysostom's authority, in the church, probably St. Sophia's or perhaps the Apostles'; and it is easy to understand how Palladius may have been led to think of "baths," if the outrages took place, for the most part, in a baptistery. Such was the profanation of the Easter-eve of 404, the 16th of April. It was somewhat like the irruption of Syrianus into the church at Alexandria, on that evening when Athanasius bade his people receive the invaders with the psalm which proclaimed the everlasting mercies of God. In the latter case, indeed, there was no such sacrilege; in the former, there was no actual homicide: but in both there was the profanation of a Christian service by brute force under Government authority.

In these miserable circumstances did the Church of Constantinople begin the actual "Day of Splendour," as the Easterns for ages have called the Sunday of the Resurrection. To Chrysostom it was always a day of supreme happiness; "a festival," as he says in an Easter-day sermon, "kept in heaven as well as in earth, common to angels and to men; a day on which 'Cherubim and Seraphim' sympathized in Christians' gladness; a day which the Lord of angels and men was not ashamed Himself to greet with joy." On such a day—as he goes on, in this glowing passage, to ask—"what reason was left for despondency?" Had he asked that question on the Easter morning of 404, he would have found that, if not in his own brave heart, yet in the hearts of many of his brethren and children in Christ, there was a sore struggle between patience and despair. All through the city, in houses and in public places,—so he himself tells us—there was loud wailing as of universal sorrow. We gather from his biographer

that the violences of Easter-eve were speedily followed by the imprisonment of priests and deacons, and the expulsion of laymen of rank from the city, for the offence of communicating with a bishop declared to be deposed; to this he himself adds that bishops of the hostile party were active during the night in thus expelling their episcopal brethren, and were "not ashamed" to go about Constantinople with military officers instead of deacons walking in front. Well might even pagans and Jews express their pity and indignation. The whole population of Churchmen, forbidden under penalties to communicate with Chrysostom, refused in the plainest manner to enter churches which were in the keeping of his foes. They went forth into the open country, to keep their Easter, as Chrysostom says, "under trees and in woods;" and Arcadius, riding out to a meadow known as the "Pempton," afterwards enclosed within the line of the Theodosian Wall, was surprised to see a great crowd of people in white. "Who are those?" he asked; and was answered by some of his body-guard, "Heretics!" The fact was that they were some three thousand neophytes, baptized amid the tumult and terror of the preceding evening, and wearing, as was usual through the great Octave, their baptismal white. It was perhaps without a direct order from Arcadius (who, we are told, had not personally authorized the late sacrilege), that some of the roughest of his guard were sent to disperse the congregation and seize the clergy. Of the latter a few were arrested; of the former a number—including some noble ladies whose veils and earrings were rudely torn off, in some cases, Palladius affirms, so rudely as to carry away part of the ear with them—were added to the company of imprisoned confessors, and joined with them in the worship and Eucharist which turned, says Palladius, the very dungeons into churches, while in the churches blows and tortures were being inflicted in order to coerce the sufferers into saying, "Anathema to John!"

So passed the Easter season. Chrysostom was still in his own house, and treated as a deposed bishop, but not as a State offender: he, doubtless, continued his episcopal oversight, as far as possible, over his adherents, who now began to be called "Joannites," and worshipped sometimes in a wooden hippodrome which Constantine had built before the city was completed—probably near the gate called the "Gate of the Circus" in the Wall of Theodosius II.—sometimes in other places, and in some instances, it seems, even in churches within the city. And to this time is to be referred the

bishop's first letter to the Roman patriarch Innocent I., who had succeeded Anastasius at the beginning of May, 402, and who, as we shall see hereafter, was a man of energy and ability. To this prelate Chrysostom now wrote, but not to him alone; three copies of the same letter were sent to the three great Italian prelates of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia. His object was to enlist the practical sympathy of influential bishops, from the Roman bishop downwards. And if he wrote to Venerius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia, we may be sure that he wrote to his old friend and "father," Flavian of Antioch. But Flavian's days were numbered; his last public demonstration, so to speak, was a steadfast refusal to acknowledge the justice of the proceedings against Chrysostom, and he died in the early part of the autumn of 404, in full communion—owing to Chrysostom's previous exertions—with the Churches of the West and of Egypt.

Let us remark, in passing, that Chrysostom here gives the most luminous expression to his view of the position of the Roman see. He did not regard that see as *the* centre of ecclesiastical justice; had he so regarded it, he must have specially applied to Pope Innocent's tribunal as the supreme court of appeal—to Pope Innocent himself as the appointed representative, for all Christendom, of the divine universal Arbiter. He could not, with any such thought in his mind, have simply sent to Pope Innocent one copy of a circular transmitted to the prelates of the chief Italian sees. Of course he would have said that the Church of Rome was a greater Church than those of Milan and Aquileia; but although he would doubtless have admitted that the bishop of Rome was first among bishops, in the sense recognised by the Council of Constantinople in 381, there seems to be no proof that he thought of the great "Apostolic see" of the West as its occupants and immediate dependents thought of it in his time. In other words, while he most firmly believed, and emphatically taught, that a primacy of honour and of influence—of influence involving a certain amount of moral authority—had been granted by Christ to the great Apostle whose faith and devotion had qualified him for such a pre-eminence, yet, as far as we know, he did not suppose this primacy to have been transmitted by St. Peter to the bishops of Rome. When, in one remarkable passage of his early work "On the Priesthood," Chrysostom spoke of "those who came after Peter" as entrusted, like him, with the charge of Christ's sheep, it appears from the context that he was thinking of a "Petrine

succession" in which all chief pastors, or prelates, of the Church had a share.

To return to Chrysostom's letter. He begins with the formula of respect used to all bishops: "To my most reverend lord, the bishop most dear to God." He gives an account of his troubles, from the arrival of Theophilus to the recent Easter-eve atrocities: it is from this account, of primary authority for the period which it covers, that we have already quoted, in words or in substance, several passages. In his narrative Chrysostom dwells—and it is a point of importance to be remembered—on the impropriety of the claim put forth on the part of the bishop of Alexandria to sit as judge on Church affairs of Constantinople. After finishing his tragical story, Chrysostom adds that "the misery is daily increasing;" that now he has reached the "extremity of woes." From the great city where he himself was bishop, agitation and division were spreading far away into the provinces of the East, severing clerics from their bishops, bishops from their colleagues, churches from churches; and the precedent set by high-handed usurpation, on the part of Theophilus and his abettors, would be followed by internecine strife and world-wide confusion. Therefore he requests, he entreats the prelates, his "most honoured and pious lords," that each of them will write to condemn the *ex parte* decisions of the Council of the Oak; to declare that those who have perverted justice by such flagrant partiality as would shock even "Sarmatians and Scythians" have incurred "the penalties of ecclesiastical law;" and furthermore, to assure him, thus unjustly treated, of their unaltered friendship and church-communion. He promised to meet any accusations brought against him before judges morally competent; he had declined to plead before notorious enemies, but he had loudly protested his readiness to abide true justice. What he had "deprecatd," he emphatically says, was "not trial, but animosity."

Chrysostom's letter to Rome was accompanied by two others, from the faithful "forty bishops" and the clergy of Constantinople: the bearers were four of the bishops, one being that Pansophius whom Chrysostom, on a day of painful agitation in regard to the case of Antoninus of Ephesus, had requested to celebrate in his stead. When these envoys and two deacons with them arrived at Rome, they found that Theophilus had been beforehand with them. He had sent a Reader with a letter to Innocent, in so curt and haughty a style as to defeat its own object. He informed Innocent that *he* had deposed the bishop of Constantinople; he

did not give any reasons, nor say with whom he had acted; and as he had not been at Constantinople at the second deposition, it is supposed by Tillemont that he felt constrained to assume responsibility for it as having been done under his counsel and at his prompting. Innocent disliked the tone of his letter, but was in some perplexity until Eusebius, a deacon of Chrysostom's, then at Rome on some Church business, went to him with a written memorial, requesting that he would wait a little and learn more about the late intrigue. Innocent had only waited three days when the envoys arrived. He read the letters, and then wrote to Chrysostom and Theophilus that he retained his ecclesiastical relations with both of them, but that the sentence recently passed on Chrysostom was, in his judgment, vitiated by partiality, and that there ought to be another synod, representing both West and East, and including no partisans of either side. After he had sent off these letters, he was visited by two other emissaries from Theophilus, bringing another letter and also some memoranda as to the Council of the Oak, according to which Chrysostom had been condemned by thirty-six bishops, of whom twenty-nine were Egyptians. "Pope Innocent," as Palladius expresses it, "read the documents, and found that the charges were not serious, and that John had not been present, nor convicted face to face; he therefore retained his disregard for Theophilus's extravagant conduct in passing so impetuous and harsh a sentence on a man in his absence," and wrote a second letter telling his "brother Theophilus" that he was still in communion with both the contending parties, and that before he could withdraw his communion from Chrysostom there must be a fair trial following on "that farce that had been played." Then, after a sharp allusion to the invalidity of Antiochene canons, the letter concluded by inviting Theophilus to attend and state his case at "a synod held according to the mind of Christ," which alone could give security to his position. It is observable that Innocent, with all his high views of the dignity and authority of his see, "did not consider," as Tillemont well expresses it, "that in his letter he was giving a judicial decision," but declared that the case ought to be finally settled by a Council unimpeachably composed. If Chrysostom's letter impresses us as ignoring the present Roman doctrine, or indeed much less extreme doctrine than the present in its entirety, on the subject of Papal authority, it is also striking to find a pope like Innocent I., *when dealing with Easterns*, so utterly silent as to any exclusive prerogative belonging

to the chair of St. Peter, and so emphatic in enforcing the authority of a legitimate synod. It is clear that he hoped by means of his Emperor, Honorius, to obtain the assembling of such a synod; and he may very probably have expected that when it met and read over the documents of the case, the fair and dignified tone of his own letters would add much to the moral weight of his see in the general mind of the Church. His predecessor Julius had upheld orthodoxy and the cause of Athanasius, and had strengthened Roman influence by doing his duty. It was just as possible, so Innocent might think, for himself to exhibit Rome as the witness for justice and for the authority of Church law as against usurpation and oppressiveness; and he would not be wanting to the opportunity. Meantime he had recourse, says Palladius, to prayer and fasting, in order to obtain a return of peace.

But Chrysostom's life, as well as his position at Constantinople, was imperilled during these Paschal weeks; two attempts were made to assassinate him. In the first case, he obtained the release of the accused person before torture had been applied to him; in the second case, the criminal was a slave of one of his "open foes." After this latter attempt, the faithful of the city were profoundly alarmed for his safety: "the more earnest among them took it in turns to guard his palace night and day," but their "zeal," says Tillemont, only brought to a head the real design of those who, without being associated for any murderous enterprise, were firmly bent on making a severance, as absolute as if by death, between Chrysostom and Constantinople. This time they were resolved there should be no weak recall, under sudden tremors, of a duly-signed imperial mandate; the work should be done thoroughly, and done once and for all.

The Easter season had come to an end, and five days afterwards the leaders of the party obtained an audience of Arcadius. Palladius makes them say, "You are under no authority, and you have authority over all; you can do what you choose: be not more gentle than presbyters, more conscientious than bishops! We told you publicly that we would take the deposition of John on our own heads. Do not spare one man at the cost of not sparing us all." Something like this they probably did say, and Arcadius ere long yielded. A "notary" was sent from the palace to bid Chrysostom "commend his affairs to God and so depart." He prepared to obey this unequivocal mandate. "Come," he said to the friendly bishops, "let us pray, and say farewell to the angel of the Church,"

meaning, of course, its guardian angel. Just then he was warned by a message from a friendly official of high rank to "go forth in haste and secretly, because Lucius, who was ready for any violence, had stationed his men in the neighbouring public baths of Zeuxippus in order to carry him off by force, and it would be well to prevent a collision between the soldiers and the people." Chrysostom saw the propriety of this advice: shedding tears, he kissed some of the bishops—"grief would not let him kiss them all"—and then, by way of farewell to "the others who were within, in the sanctuary," he said, "Stay here, while I go to take a little rest." He passed into the baptistery, and there addressed his devoted friends, the deaconess Olympias (who made her home in the precincts of St. Sophia) and three other women, with two other deaconesses, Pentadia and Procla, and a widow, Silvina. "Come here, my daughters, and listen to me; I see that my day is over, my course is run; you will, perhaps, see my face again no more. This is what I beg of you: do not, any of you, give up your loyal interest in the Church, and if any one is brought in as bishop who has not canvassed for the appointment but has received it unwillingly and has the assent of all, bend your heads to him, as you have done to John—for the Church cannot be without a bishop. And so may God have mercy on you: remember me in your prayers." Few speeches of farewell from a pastor, since that day of sad parting on the shore of Miletus, can have touched hearts so deeply as these simple words from "the Mouth of Gold." The poor women fell weeping at his feet. He beckoned to one of the most venerable of the presbyters, and said, "Take them away, lest they stir up the people." There was a crowd before the great western gate of the cathedral, where his horse was standing, as if he were to go away from that side. But this was a kindly meant deception; he went out by a door on the east, and so parted for ever from St. Sophia. All that he said at that bitter moment was, "I am driven out without having been tried—by sheer force, not by law—treated worse than murderers and sorcerers." He was put on board a small boat, and landed once more in Bithynia. It was Monday, June 20, 404,—only six years and four months since Theophilus had consecrated him in that same cathedral. Cardinal Newman, in the exquisite chapters on St. Chrysostom which adorn his "*Historical Sketches*," thus interprets his feelings at this sad moment: "Oh how down was his heart, and what sorrowful thoughts chased one another across it!"

Some of the hostile party closed the church gates after his departure, fearing a popular tumult, so that a number of the faithful were shut in. The crowd outside, on finding that their bishop was gone, became wildly agitated: some rushed to the shore as if to detain him; others fled in fear of being involved in what the authorities would call a sedition. Violent efforts were made to force open the doors, which were ultimately broken in with stones or pulled off their hinges; a rush took place, including Jews and pagans as well as Churchmen, the former indulging in scornful hisses and hootings, while the latter were bewailing their irreparable loss, and the soldiers were giving vent to their brutal fury in beating and torturing the weaker among them. It was then that a fire broke out suddenly in the church, beginning at the throne, leaping upward and catching the roof, until the whole structure was in a blaze, except the sacristy chapel. From noon to 3 p.m. the cathedral glowed and flashed like "a burning mountain, the work of many years being consumed in three hours;" and the excited crowd in the Augustæum saw the flames stream over their heads "as over a bridge," and seize the senate-house, not by that part of it which was nearest the church, but on the side next the palace—a circumstance interpreted by some as a special token of divine intervention. No life was lost, either of man or beast, in this destruction of stately buildings. The question of accident or incendiarism was answered by mutual imputations, the friends of Chrysostom and his foes accusing each other of having burned what had been his church; and even Socrates asserts, as a fact, that the former were guilty. Two bishops who had accompanied Chrysostom to Nicæa were arrested and brought back and imprisoned on this absurd charge. Even Chrysostom himself was harshly treated, as under suspicion; and wrote accordingly, "Although you have not given me an opportunity to defend myself on the other charges, at any rate let me be heard as to that of setting fire to my church." Some of his adherents were afterwards brought before the tribunals on this account, and put to the torture: Eutropius, a chanter, died upon the rack, after agonies which recall the tales of martyrdom. Socrates refrains from describing the severities inflicted on Chrysostom's friends by Optatus, the prefect of the city, "who was a pagan and, as such, a hater of Christians."

Amid these scenes of horror a new bishop was appointed for Constantinople in the person of Arsacius, a man of eighty, the

brother of Nectarius. He had once declined the see of Tarsus, whereupon Nectarius pettishly taxed him with hoping to outlive and to succeed him at Constantinople, and Arsacius pacified him by promising, with an oath on the Gospels, never to accept any see whatever. This man appeared to Eudoxia to be a fit occupant of the great bishopric, being naturally enfeebled by age (if he ever had any force of character), and certainly unlikely to disturb the repose of the court by bold speech or resolute action; but the historians, viewing him with some indulgence, describe him as "pious" and "mild-tempered to an extreme." He was consecrated in the Apostles' Church on the 26th or 27th of June. "It is," says Tillemont in his characteristic way, "a judgment of God, at which one cannot sufficiently marvel, that Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom, the two greatest men that the Church of Constantinople ever had, should have been succeeded by two such brothers as Nectarius and Arsacius." The adherents of Chrysostom could not consider that the new bishop was one whom he would have them recognise. They utterly disowned him, as "leagued" with Chrysostom's enemies. Arsacius, gentle though he was by nature, did not think fit to put up with such treatment, and appealed to the civil power. The soldiers, who thereupon appeared as supporters of Arsacius, and were charged to break up the "Joannite" gatherings in the remoter parts of the city, "went beyond their instructions" in the violence which they used. If one or two of the presbyters, as Theophilus and Sallust, were timorous about holding "illegal" services, the temper of the faithful laity would not be subdued: many absented themselves from the forums and baths; others, like the aged and excellent Nicarete, who from humility had declined the office of deaconess, withdrew from the city. Olympias repelled the charge of being concerned in the late fire, by observing that she had spent her substance on restoring the temples of God, and stood out, when other ladies gave way, against the prefect's exhortations to communicate with Arsacius. "If you were to employ force to make me communicate, against law, with those with whom I ought not, still I should not do what is forbidden to religious people." For that time she was dismissed, but on a later occasion she was heavily fined and expelled from the city. Tigris, a priest, once a slave, who was famed for his kindness to the poor, was scourged and tortured. We gather some notions of the treatment of the Joannites of Constantinople from a letter of Chrysostom to another of the faithful deaconesses

already mentioned, Pentadia; he speaks of perjury, torturing, scourging, even capital punishment; and it seems that he was well informed of all that passed in Constantinople while he remained in Bithynia.

For about a fortnight Chrysostom was kept at Nicæa; he enjoyed the invigorating air of the place, and doubtless its unique religious associations; his guards were even "more sedulous than he could have desired" in providing for his comfort; and he wrote often to Olympias, whose chief satisfaction was in hearing from him and receiving his exhortations to patience under present affliction. On the eve of his departure he informed the presbyter Constantius of his destined place of exile, Cucusus, a remote little town in Lower Armenia, of evil omen for a successor of that bishop Paul who had died there under suspicious circumstances in 357, but still a meeting-point of "several roads" and the seat of a bishop. Before Chrysostom started eastwards, he took measures for the extermination of paganism and the building of churches in Phœnicia—for the continuance, that is, of the work which a few years before he had actively promoted: just as, before his expulsion, he had been preparing a movement against the singularly persistent heresy of Marcion, which was besetting the very city of Salamis where Epiphanius, that *malleus hæreticorum*, had so long sat as bishop. It is characteristic of our Saint to busy himself with these plans and hopes amid his own sore troubles, and to exhort Constantius "not to let calamities make him supine." "If we don't do our duty, it will be no excuse that we are in a storm of troubles."

Having written to Olympias on the 3rd of July, he left Nicæa on the 4th, and began (probably by mule-carriage) a journey which was rendered irksome by oppressive heat, by fever and sleeplessness, and by the bitter hostility of Leontius of Ancyra, whom he calls "that Galatian;" but he had compensations in the sympathetic respect which he met with on his entrance into Cappadocia, still more when he reached the episcopal city of St. Basil and found himself at once in circumstances of comparative comfort. It enhances the human interest of the story to find Chrysostom dwelling with humorous pleasure on the small solaces of his Cæsarean resting-place. He was still suffering from fever: but then he had "pure water to drink, and bread to eat that was not mouldy or rotten;" he could wash, "not in bits of jars, but in a real bath, such as it was, and could actually lie on a bed;" still

more, there were first-rate physicians who "did him as much good by their kindly sympathy as by their professional skill," and one of whom even offered to accompany him on his onward journey. There were others whom he playfully calls his "bodyguard"—clerics, laymen, monks, nuns, and persons of all conditions: men of high civil rank treated him as "the apple of their eye," and his military conductors, good-hearted fellows who had become warmly attached to him, thought themselves happy in every opportunity of rendering him any menial service. His cheery buoyant spirit, sustained by the habit of "giving thanks for all things," rose bravely to the occasion: he put the best face on everything, took full advantage of the "days of refreshing" thus granted; and his quiet lodging at one end of the great city, with its homely comforts, became the scene of a general and cordial homage which did as much, or more, towards invigorating him as the prescriptions of his doctors and the attention of his guards. But Pharetrius, the archbishop of Cæsarea, was a man of paltry nature, who contrasts very pitifully with his warm-hearted and generous flock. He had been too cautious to attend the Council of the Oak, but had written—without any necessity—to signify his assent to its decisions. He had again shifted round, in appearance, by sending a cordial message to Chrysostom when he was approaching Cæsarea. But Chrysostom could not believe in his sincerity; and now, while everybody in Cæsarea was calling on the illustrious exile, Pharetrius, as he tersely puts it, "was nowhere." In fact, "he was waiting for me to go away—why, I don't know, but I suspect that he was jealous of the attentions lavished upon me."

As soon as Chrysostom had recruited himself, he prepared to go on to Cucusus, when an alarm arose that the Isaurian highlanders were making one of their frequent raids. Ammianus a few years earlier had described these irrepressible barbarians, and the "savage howl" that announced their desperate onset: their descents from an "inaccessible retreat in the rocks" of Mount Taurus had long been a source of terror in Southern Cappadocia. A military force went forth to beat them back; but in the general panic, under which even old men were detailed for sentry work on the town walls, a fierce crowd of fanatical monks—perhaps obeying a hint from their bishop—surrounded Chrysostom's lodging at daybreak, and cried, "We will burn the house if *he* does not go away." The shock, it seems, brought back one of his feverish

attacks; even his guards were scared by the fury of "those wild beasts," as they called the monks—"worse by far than any Isaurians!" It was vain to remonstrate, impossible to resist; the governor of the city did his best, but found his authority powerless in the face of this exhibition of what monks could be and could do—of the hideous abuse of which Eastern "asceticism" was capable. Chrysostom, once almost fanatical in the cause of monasticism, had now a new experience in that line: the brutal demonstration was repeated next day; the clergy, ashamed or afraid of their primate, hid themselves and ignored all messages from Chrysostom: and at midday he placed himself in his litter, and left Cæsarea, amid the grief of its inhabitants, whose inability to put down the monastic ruffians is a proof of the tyranny which such men could exercise. The kindly offer of a country house, belonging to a prefect's widow named Seleucia, was baffled by Pharetrius, who put such pressure on her that she caused Chrysostom, after a few hours' rest, to be awakened by a false report that "the Isaurians were coming." "What am I to do?" he asked. Euethius, a priest, apparently of Constantinople, Chrysostom's companion on the journey, helped him to get into his litter on a pitch-dark night, but forbade the use of torches "for fear the glare should attract the Isaurians." The mule that drew the litter stumbled, and threw Chrysostom out; Euethius put his arms round him, and so enabled him to crawl up a steep pathway, while a new fever fit had seized him.

The painful south-eastward journey was performed without further mishap; and he arrived at Cucusus, which he describes with excusable exaggeration as "the most desolate place on earth, at the very end of the world, without shops or market" (this perhaps is to be understood relatively), and within reach of brigands. Yet here again his spirits rose. As Newman puts it, "he soon rallied, and began to colour everything with his own sweet, cheerful, thankful temper: he was pleased with all that was in any way pleasant; he made the best of what was bad;" he enjoyed the utter quiet, the leisure, the good air. Offers of service came in on all sides: a man of rank, Discorus, gave up his own house to Chrysostom, spent money on making it warmer, left nothing undone for his comfort; the bishop, Adelphius, actually proposed to resign his see in Chrysostom's favour; loyal friends, among them an elderly deaconess, paid him visits; he felt better than when he was at home; the Isaurians had retired

home for the winter; he could busy himself in the congenial occupation of writing to Olympias and other correspondents. Few things bring him nearer to us than his craving for letters from absent friends; and his own letters, if we can allow for rhetorical exuberances, must needs stand high for tenderness, vividness, occasional gleams of fun, and transparent simplicity. They show, as Gibbon candidly remarks, a firmness of mind such as Cicero in his exile was far from displaying, and also what Newman truly calls the natural, genial, *human* character of his temperament, "the discriminating affectionateness with which he accepts every one for what is personal in him and unlike others." Here we may for the present leave him, in order to observe the progress of the "affair of John" at Constantinople.

It seems that when the "Joannite" bishops knew of the intention to confine Chrysostom at Cucusus, they sent a letter, signed by twenty-five or more, to inform Innocent, and that he answered by letters of communion for Chrysostom and all who adhered to him, in which, says Palladius, he exhorted the suffering prelates to patience, and regretted that he himself was "prevented by certain men powerful for evil from rendering any help." This clearly alludes to the strained relations then existing between the two imperial brothers by reason of Stilicho's designs on the East; and a peremptory letter addressed by Honorius to Arcadius, if we may accept it on the authority of a Vatican manuscript, may have rather injured than promoted the interests of justice and of Chrysostom. An agent of the opposite party, a priest named Paternus, described as an "ugly little fellow," appeared at Rome, uttered foul language against Chrysostom, and presented a letter in which Acacius and other prelates charged him with the burning of St. Sophia; but to this Innocent vouchsafed no reply. Meantime the Constantinopolitan court dropped all proceedings about the fire, but in no way relaxed its severities towards Joannites, confiscating houses in which it could be shown that bishops or clerics who had been proved to hold "conventicles external to the Church" had found entertainment or shelter. A law to this effect was promulgated on August 29, 404; another law fined all masters who did not hinder their slaves from attending such meetings, and all corporations or guilds of which any member had been detected in such nonconformity. A third law came forth on the 18th of November, ordering all provincial governors to put down the "unlawful assemblies" of persons who, "relying on their

adhesion to orthodoxy, contemned the holy churches, and dissented from the communion of Arsacius, Theophilus, and Porphyrius:” according to Palladius, it further threatened recalcitrant bishops with deprivation from office and loss of property.

This last name represents one of the worst episcopal appointments that discredit the Church in the fifth century. Flavian of Antioch died early in autumn, having totally disowned Arsacius; the man whom he had admitted to orders was still for him *the* bishop of Constantinople. And now who was to succeed Flavian? There was a disposition to elect Constantius, a correspondent of Chrysostom who was of long standing among the Antiochene clergy, and is described in engaging colours as a dignified person with keen eyes and cheerful face, a face that even in illness never lost its bright smile, and in character above praise, quick in perception, equitable, forbearing, always taking a “considerate” view of a case, tender-hearted and persuasive. But the Court party could not brook the elevation of Constantius; a brother presbyter of his, Porphyrius, discredibly known (if we are to believe Palladius) to the magistrates, clever and unprincipled, with a personal grudge against Chrysostom, contrived to secure the agency of three bishops, and got them to consecrate him within closed doors, while a quadrennial festival still nominally associated with the “cultus” of Hercules had drawn out the Antiochenes to Daphne. On their return, before the prayers of the service were finished, the people, in furious mood, rushed to the house of Porphyrius, threatening to burn it and him; but he escaped, procured the support of a military force under a count named Valentinus, and by such means extorted recognition from the mass of the Church-folk of Antioch, though the leading clergy and the devout ladies “would not even go near the walls” of the Golden Church while Porphyrius sat on the throne of Meletius and Flavian. Not only were the six simoniacal bishops of the Ephesine province restored to their sees, but the great see of St. Timothy was profaned by the intrusion of a nameless scoundrel whom Palladius brands with thirteen vituperative epithets, and accuses (truly or not) of participation in Bacchic revels and impudent profligacy; “on this accursed head,” he cries, “they did not shrink from placing the Gospel open!” Sarapion, whom Chrysostom had unwisely made bishop of Heraclea (one sees not by what canonical right), was “accused of many offences without evidence,” hunted out of his place of refuge among the Gothic monks, cruelly beaten, and

sent to his native Egypt; while the priest Eugenius, who had brought to Chrysostom citations from the Council of the Oak, was rewarded by promotion to the vacated see.

It was probably about the end of September that Chrysostom had settled down in his new abode. For a while, his recovered health and his freedom from immediate anxieties became apparent in his correspondence; but as the winter of 404-5 drew on—it came with unusual severity in that harsh climate—he suffered from headache, sickness, sleeplessness, and intense cold. One has to picture him self-immured in his room, heaping up continual fires, half-choked with smoke, often lying all day in bed under a mass of wrappings, but still cheerful in acknowledging more gifts or offerings for his personal wants, real or supposed, than he knew what to do with: some of them he even returned, with the assurance that he would freely ask for such help when he should require them. Visitors still came—a bishop named Seleucus, who had an “obstinate cough,” on account of which Chrysostom gave him a letter of introduction to one of his own medical friends at Cæsarea; Aphraates, a bearer of gifts from a rich well-wisher at Antioch, with an urgent entreaty that they might not be refused, in spite of which Chrysostom requested him to send the money to the missionaries in Phœnicia; and Libanius, whose name would remind him of his old pagan rhetoric-master, and who brought him news of the affairs of Antioch. Several of his Antiochene friends wrote to him: to others he wrote, earnestly asking for letters, and anxious, no doubt, as to the difficulties caused by the elevation of Porphyrius to that see. His interest in mission-work among the pagans led him to commend to one of his friends a priest named Elpidius, who had been converting north-Syrian mountaineers, and planting churches and even monasteries among them. He learned that Unilas, whom he had consecrated as bishop for the Goths, was dead, and that his deacon had come to Constantinople with a request for a successor; and he urged Olympias to use what influence she had to get the matter postponed, so as to prevent an appointment by the usurper of his own see. With money received from her he was able to ransom some captives from the Isaurians; and he endeared himself to many Armenians by the charm of his presence and the “gold” of his words. He learned with satisfaction that Arsacius was disowned by the Churches of Phœnicia and Palestine, and praised John of Jerusalem for having ignored “the authors of division.”

Another bishop, whose charitable activity he acknowledged in cordial terms, was that Theodore of Mopsuestia who was afterwards too well known as the true founder of a heresy which nullified the divine side of the Incarnation. On the other hand, he was informed that he must reckon the Church of Tarsus as among those which, under pressure, had recognised the intruder into his own bishopric. Of the affairs of Constantinople he knew apparently everything that could interest him. Maruthas, bishop of Martyropolis, who had already done some good work in Persia, but had sat in the Council of the Oak, was now on a visit to the capital: Chrysostom, by opening a correspondence with him, attempted, we know not with what results, to "draw him out of the pit" of factious intrigue. The death of the city-prefect's brother drew from him a letter of condolence; two priests were congratulated on the honour of being expelled from teacherships in schools for their faithful boldness of spirit; two others who had been negligent of their duties, one of whom had preached but five times up to October, incurred his episcopal rebuke, and with them one who ought to have admonished them. He took thought for the poor and more helpless members of his flock; requested a rich layman named Valentinus to provide for the distressed widows and virgins, and thanked the tribune Marcian for his benevolent liberality. Olympias told him by letters of her own sufferings in his cause, and he strove to support her against temptations to despondency. It is the more remarkable that he never mentions an event which in his eyes must have looked like a terrible retribution, the death of Eudoxia in premature childbirth, October 6, 404. It might have been expected that this would arrest the progress of persecution. "But," says Tillemont, with startling terseness, "when a fire is once kindled, you do not put it out by punishing the incendiary."

In fact, as we have already seen, the law decreeing deprivation and forfeiture of property as the penalty of not communicating with Theophilus, Arsacius, and Porphyrius, was published on the 18th of November, *i.e.* several weeks after the death of the Empress. One result of this law was the arrival of several bishops at Rome, who had been ejected from their sees. The first was Cyriacus, bishop of Synnada, who brought no letters, but whose ready eloquence made up for the want of them; he probably came to Rome at the beginning of 405. To him Chrysostom had addressed, after his arrival at Cucusus in the autumn of the preceding year, one of his best-known letters; and to its lofty and animating

exhortations might be traced the energy which Cyriacus exhibited in his journey to the West. Cyriacus was followed by Eulysius of Apamea, who was accredited by letters from fifteen bishops "of John's synod" and from the venerable Anysius of Thessalonica. These documents depicted the wretched state of the Church of Constantinople; and Anysius, who had long acted as the vicar of the see of Rome in Eastern Illyricum, declared himself ready to abide by its judgment. A month later, Palladius of Helenopolis arrived; he said that he had had "to fly from the fury of the magistrates," and showed a copy of the new Eastern penal law. Then appeared the presbyter Germanus, and the famous John Cassian, whom Chrysostom had ordained deacon; they showed the inventory of gold and silver vessels and vestments, which (in spite of the accusation against Chrysostom) were in the possession of the Church of Constantinople until they were surrendered, under compulsion, to certain high officers of state. Demetrius of Pessinus came next, who had done his best to "proclaim" in various Eastern countries "that the Roman Church was in communion with" Chrysostom; he had letters to show in which the Carian bishops "embraced" the latter's communion, and others in which the faithful priests of Antioch "invited," as Palladius expresses it, "the establishment among themselves of the good order of the Romans," and "deplored the consecration of Porphyrius as illegal and unrighteous." Last of all this series of aggrieved "Joannites" came Domitianus the church steward of Constantinople, and another who must have excited more curiosity and interest than any other visitant, Vallagas, a priest of the famous border city of Nisibis, who "told of the afflictions of the monasteries in Mesopotamia." Evidence of the harsh treatment of ladies at Constantinople by the new prefect was not wanting; and, as in the old Arian times at the Council of Sardica, there were persons present, "ascetics and virgins," who actually showed the marks on their sides and backs which had been left by rack and scourge.

"After all this," says Palladius, "Pope Innocent could endure it no longer," and sent to Chrysostom a letter which Sozomen has preserved. He exhorts him to patience, so that the outrages he had endured might not be more potent to crush him than his good conscience to sustain hope. It was often the best of men whose powers of endurance were put to hardest trial. "Conscience is truly a solid support under injustice; and he who cannot conquer injustice by patience exposes his character to suspicion. For one

who relies on God, and then on his conscience, ought to endure all things, inasmuch as a good man can indeed be exercised in order to endurance, but conquered never—for his mind is guarded by Holy Scripture. Those lessons which we read to the people abound in examples, and assure us that almost all the saints have been variously and continuously afflicted and subjected to a testing scrutiny, as the condition of their attaining the crown of patience. Take comfort, then, reverend brother, in your own conscience which comforts the virtuous under affliction. For under the oversight of Christ our Lord the purified conscience will reach the harbour of peace." Innocent also wrote a letter of sympathy to the faithful clergy of Constantinople "subject to bishop John." There was no remedy, he said, but patient trust in God, who could, and would in His own time, bring all these troubles to an end, and good out of them. After all, it was no new thing for His faithful servants to suffer. In the present case their bishop had been condemned on an *ex parte* inquiry by those who were officially bound to maintain Church order; sees legitimately occupied had been filled up as if vacant, but what right could accrue to the men thus intruded? Something had been said about a breach of canons on the part of John; but the canons alluded to were not Catholic, and no canons were binding on Catholics except those of Nicæa. The canons now quoted ought not only not to be obeyed, but ought to be condemned, as they had been at Sardica. The practical conclusion was that nothing less than a legitimate Council could abate the present storm, which had been stirred up by the malignity of the fiend; and this remedy must be patiently awaited from the will of God and Christ. "If," said Innocent with truly Christian emphasis, "we are but firm in faith, there is nothing we ought to despair of obtaining from the Lord." He added that he was seriously considering the best means of procuring an Œcumenical Council, and that the account of Constantinopolitan troubles which had reached him had been confirmed beforehand by four bishops who had visited him at Rome and had replied to his careful questioning.

Innocent next addressed a letter to Honorius, at the newly chosen western capital of Ravenna, beseeching his aid for the procuring of a new synod. Honorius desired that in the first place a Western Council should meet, and, if unanimous, report to him; but it was found impossible to hold a full synod even of the West, on account of barbaric incursions; the bishops of Italy, however,

met, and requested their Emperor "to write to his brother to order a general Council to be held at Thessalonica," as a convenient meeting-place for East and West. Honorius, thereupon, desired Innocent to send five bishops, with two priests and one deacon of the Roman Church, as bearers of a letter to Arcadius. The emperor began by reminding his brother that he had twice before written to remonstrate against the injustice which "bishop John" had suffered. "I now again write, in my deep anxiety for the Church's peace which is a condition of our Empire's, that you may be pleased to order the bishops of the East to assemble at Thessalonica. For the bishops of our West, having chosen out men who cannot be bent to wickedness and falsehood, have sent five bishops, and two presbyters and one deacon of the great Church of the Romans: be pleased to receive them with all honour; so that, if they shall be persuaded that John was justly expelled, they may instruct me to withdraw from *his* communion; or if they shall have convicted the Eastern bishops of wilful misdoing, they may turn you away from *their* communion. The opinion entertained by the Westerns respecting bishop John will appear by two subjoined letters, selected from the mass of those which have been sent to me, and equivalent to them in purport—I mean those of the bishops of Rome and Aquileia. But this I specially request of your Clemency: order Theophilus of Alexandria to be present, even against his will, for he is said to have been the prime cause of all the mischief; so that the synod of bishops may meet with no hindrances, and may settle such a peace as our times require."

The chief of the five Western bishops referred to in the letter was Æmilius of Beneventum; but another was more eminent personally, if the Gaudentius mentioned by Palladius was the celebrated bishop of Brescia. The delegates, who were accompanied by Palladius and the three other refugee bishops, carried letters not only from Honorius, from Innocent, and from Chromatius of Aquileia, but from Venerius of Milan and others. They had also a note or paper of instructions from "the whole Western synod"—by which Palladius apparently means the Council of Italy, as representative of the West—in which it was ordered that "John" should be restored to his church and to communion before he was tried, that he might have no ground for demurring to plead; that is, the decisions of 403 and 404 were to be treated as null or as in suspense, with a view to a full investigation *de novo*. But the result of this mission was such as neither Innocent nor

Honorius could have thought possible. The ruling powers at Constantinople were more than ever determined to repel all Western interference—the rather that the *de facto* episcopate had recently passed from feeble into vigorous hands. The worn-out old man who had usurped Chrysostom's throne during seventeen months died on the 11th of November, 405, and was succeeded, after much canvassing and an interval of four months, by Atticus, who had been one of the clerical malcontents, and of whom Socrates and Sozomen draw a rather engaging picture as industrious, affable, a good administrator though only a mediocre preacher, munificent to the poor of all persuasions, sympathetic towards the afflicted, and lenient towards sectarians. But these amiable qualities were not exhibited towards “Joannites,” for on finding himself disowned by bishops and lay people he procured a new edict similar to that which had been put forth in the time of his predecessor, sentencing any bishop who declined to communicate with himself, Theophilus, and Porphyrius, to expulsion from church and home, while persons in civil dignity were to forfeit their rank, and inferiors to be fined and exiled. Accordingly, when the delegates and the Joannite fugitives were approaching Athens, they were arrested by a tribune and put into the charge of a centurion, who carried them in two ships to a place within sight of Constantinople; thence they were taken to a Thracian fortress named Athyra, where the Latins were shut up in one small room, and the Easterns in others, and not allowed the attendance of a servant. Their captors or jailors demanded their papers. “How can we,” they replied, “the legates of our Emperor and of bishops, give up our credentials to any one but your Emperor?” But coercion was used to obtain the papers, and one of the Italian bishops had his thumb broken in the process; and when bribes failed to corrupt their fidelity, the Latins were put on board a “rotten vessel,” and after obtaining a better one at Lampsacus found themselves once more on Italian ground in Calabria, with what Palladius calls a “Babylonish” story to tell.

This humiliating failure, which led Pope Innocent to break off all communion with Theophilus and Atticus, took place in the summer of 406; for the preparations, including the assembling of an Italian synod, had necessarily taken up time. The year 405 had brought no new distress to Chrysostom, though much to his faithful supporters. He had, indeed, suffered from the cold and also from some illness, and, after shaking it off during the spring, had need

to take particular care of his diet, and the summer heat tried him greatly: but he had been deeply interested in work quite apart from his own cause or that of his friends. One might almost forget that he was a persecuted, deposed, and exiled prelate, while observing the enthusiasm with which, like Wilfrid in his exile, he threw himself into the interests of the mission work in Phœnicia. It is inspiring to find him exhorting a priest named Nicolaus to urge good and true men to devote themselves to this field of labour, and encouraging the monks and priests who were striving against paganism in that district to persevere fearlessly in their holy enterprise, for which he had provided them with clothes, shoes, and all necessities, from funds placed at his disposal. So, too, a year afterwards, he treated a fierce pagan outbreak in which many monks had been slain or wounded as a call for fresh exertion, and conjured Rufinus, a priest whom he thought highly qualified, to hasten without hesitation or delay into Phœnicia, to write to him at every stage of his journey, and to employ all the resources of firmness and gentleness in the critical task of dealing with the exasperated heathens. "When I hear that you have actually crossed the border of Phœnicia," so wrote the exile of Cucusus, "then I shall be at ease. I will help you to the utmost of my power, even if I have to write a thousand times to Constantinople." It was impossible for Chrysostom under any, the worst, personal trials to forget the general interest of the Divine kingdom: in Montfaucon's words, "Never did sorrow, illness, or other anxieties turn aside our John from *the* anxiety as to propagating the Faith."

He had, at the end of 405 and the beginning of 406, a more serious experience than ever of the "perils of robbers;" the depredations of the wild Isaurians, which in the early part of 405 had brought rapine and butchery near the gates of Cucusus, and rendered travelling utterly unsafe, were now so fiercely renewed that the peaceful inhabitants were fain to change their abodes time after time, to adopt a "nomad" life as the best means of escape from slaughter or slavery, and sometimes to mourn over children frozen to death. Accordingly Chrysostom, in spite of his often recurring ailments, and amid the rigours of another Armenian winter, found himself obliged to take shelter in the castle or fortress which dominated the town of Arabissus, twenty leagues east of Cucusus. The country around was deep in snow, but it also exhibited bloody tokens of the robbers' presence; the town was unsafe; and even within the castle there was continual expectation of an

attack. "We sit here," wrote Chrysostom, "as in a snare. One night, most unexpectedly, a band of three hundred Isaurians fell upon the town, and all but got hold of us. But while I was asleep and unconscious of my danger, the hand of God speedily turned them aside." Amid all his sufferings from alarm and cold and severe illness—there were doctors at hand, but no sufficiency of medicines—he found work to do among the poor people of the district: the bishop was only too glad of his help, and many an ignorant soul was indebted for its first conceptions of Christian truth to those "golden lips" which, in Arabissus as in St. Sophia, must needs speak for God to the heart of man. Here, as at Cucusus, he had the comfort of the friendship of the local bishop, Otreius, whom he mentions affectionately in a letter of the same year. It was not until the summer of 406 that he found it safe to quit his stronghold and return to Cucusus.

And when the state of the country, in the early part of that year, permitted him to receive letters or visitors, we may well imagine the eager interest with which he would grasp at any hope of relief or redress through the friendly Western intervention. Already, in the previous year, he had written in a tone of hearty gratitude and approbation to the four bishops, Cyriacus, Demetrius, Palladius, and Eulysius, who had gone to the West "in the cause of all the Churches," and who had requested him to send back to them a deacon named Cyriacus, the bearer of Innocent's letter of sympathy to Chrysostom, as an assistant. Cyriacus was then too much exhausted by his recent journey from Italy to undertake another mission; but Chrysostom told his four colleagues that a presbyter named John and a deacon named Paul were meditating a voyage to Rome—though it appears that they were, in fact, prevented from going until a year later. And Chrysostom, while he now wrote to several friendly bishops in the West to thank them for their sympathy, and particularly to the Western legates (as well as to Anysius of Thessalonica and his neighbour prelates, and to Alexander of Corinth, gently complaining of his silence), had also not omitted to renew the expression of his gratitude to Cyriacus of Synnada and the others "who had come with the Western bishops,"—exhibiting in these despatches, which the faithful presbyter Euethius had conveyed, a hope of better days, of deliverance, of justice, to be secured by so great a demonstration. What, then, must have been his grief when he gradually heard, not only of the insulting repulse of the Western delegates, but of the

barbarities practised towards their Eastern brethren! He first heard a rumour, says Palladius, that Cyriacus and his three colleagues had been thrown into the sea. But it was afterwards known that Cyriacus had been carried off to Palmyra, Eulysius to an "Arabian" fortress called Mispas, lying near the Saracens, Palladius to Syene on the Ethiopian frontier, Demetrius to one of the Oases; and that the guards who had the charge of conducting them to these places of confinement had treated them with the most odious brutality, urging them on beyond their strength, and making them pass the nights amid vile company in inns, or among Jews and Samaritans in synagogues. The prelates of Theophilus's party had shown no compassion or forbearance towards any of the hapless Joannites who passed, thus miserably, through their towns: some of them, and especially the bishop of Ancyra, even bribed the guards to prevent laymen from offering hospitality to the prisoners. But beside these four special victims of anti-Joannite cruelty—one of whom (Palladius) says, "As long as I have the truth, I have all things"—there are others whose confessorship is recorded in the same context. Of Sarapion's banishment we have already spoken: it was said that he had all his teeth pulled out. Heraclides was in prison at Nicomedia. Antonius was among the rocks of Judæa; Elpidius of Laodicea in Syria spent three years concealed in an upper room; another bishop lived by fishing at Troas; others had fled, and many clerics were similarly homeless. We can hardly wonder that the endurance of some Joannite bishops gave way, and that in despair they acknowledged Atticus. Nor should it be forgotten that beside fugitive ecclesiastics, monks and laymen were put under ban: we read, for instance, of a soldier employed in one of the "schools" or bands on guard at the palace, who, accused as a Joannite, was cruelly beaten, tortured, and banished to Petra. Things seemed to be at their worst.

It was, therefore, in a tone which, for him, was almost mournful that Chrysostom, after midsummer in 406, wrote a second letter to Innocent. "I know," he said in effect, "how earnestly you have laboured in my cause: if you have failed, it is in consequence of the insatiable hostility of those who are determined to persecute me to the end; still, do not lose heart nor throw up the contention, but rather increase your efforts in proportion to the increased fury of the storm. I expect that there will be something like a setting right of all the wrong. But if not, still the crown awaits you at

God's hands; and I, now in my third year of exile, exposed to famine, pestilence, wars, besiegings, indescribable lonesomeness, daily death, and Isaurian swords, amid all this derive no slight consolation from your firm and lasting good-will, your boldness, your endearing and most genuine love. This," he continued in the warmth of his heart, "is to me a wall, a quiet harbour, a treasure of innumerable blessings, a groundwork of abundant gladness." He wrote in a similar strain to other Western bishops; and in one letter, addressed to a number of them, he assured them of the fervent thankfulness and affection which their active interest in the good cause had earned throughout the East. "If the original authors of this trouble will not even now abandon their partisan hostility, let not this disturb you, or make you relax your efforts; for the greater the labour that you undertake, the greater will be your crown."

His own labour was coming to an end; his own crown, we may surely say, was not far off. He enjoyed an intermission of his bodily ailments, and had become acclimatised to the Armenian winter. He knew, by this time, how most effectually to protect himself against its severities; and by constantly keeping up a fire and staying indoors, he managed to take no harm. He had obtained from a pious lady a remedy for his stomach complaints which, he says, was always successful, and was in such good health and spirits as to excite the astonishment of his Armenian friends, who, accustomed as they were to their own winters, still felt the cold severely. He employed himself, also, once more, in the composition of religious treatises; the discourse on the thesis "That no one can harm the man who does not injure himself," and the subsequent book, addressed to those who are "scandalised" under calamities, are ascribed to this year 406, or the following year. Of the first of these works he writes to Olympias: "If you are well enough, read it aloud." In the second he refers to the existing troubles as having been caused by various agents—clerics, military men, bishops—but as having intensified the moral weight of "the Church's witness to mankind." "When she was not harassed, she did not teach so persuasively as *now* she teaches the world to endure suffering, to show self-command, to bear trials, to despise riches and high offices, life and country, friends and kindred. And this lesson is taught not by one man only, nor by two or three, but by the entire people; and not by words only, but by actions. Those," he continues, "who thus teach, now

appear in the market-place, live in their houses, come to Church service, with bright faces, and free glance, and boldness indescribable; while the perpetrators of evil are detected in their plots, and bear about with them an evil conscience, and live in trembling and fear."

This remarkable buoyancy of spirit expressed itself also in a striking passage of the letter reckoned as the fourth to Olympias, written from Cucusus in 407. He tells his faithful friend, in language which reads strangely in the light of the event, that she may expect ere long to see him again. "I do not say this merely to comfort you, but I know that it will certainly be so. Unless this were to take place, I should, I think, have long ago departed this life, under the pressure of so many trials." He hoped, one infers (and even under the discouragements of 406 he may have cherished some such fond anticipation), that he would be recalled to Constantinople, that the days of his exile would be ended, and all the wrongs and sorrows of past years be, even in this world, abundantly rectified and relieved. "But," says Montfaucon with quiet solemnity, "it fell out in another way than he supposed."

He was, indeed, not wrong in depicting the uneasiness, the vague haunting alarm and heavy anxiety, which his triumphant persecutors experienced when they found that "the respectful attention of the Christian world was still fixed on that desert spot among the mountains of Taurus," that his Armenian abode was eagerly visited by Antiochene Churchmen and by others who revered his character and deplored his sufferings. To hear of such pilgrimages, as they might be called, was to his old enemies "as tormenting as a scourge," and their very clergy, if one can trust Palladius's rhetoric, marvelled at the power exercised over men who sat in the high places of the earth by one solitary exiled Bishop—"as if a dead man had struck living men with terror." Over the effect on the leaders of the anti-Joannite faction was not sawing, but infuriating. "They had sentenced him to die," and Newman; "they had no wish to do the deed themselves," hoped that "circumstances might do it for them." So, in the first of June, 407, they procured an order from Arcadius for his removal in spot on the north-eastern shore of the Euxine. Those who made this use of the imperial puppet intended to kill their victim "by inches" through the exhaustion of a long and painful journey.

In obedience to this mandate, the two guards who were in charge forced him to travel so rapidly that his strength gave tokens of utterly breaking down. One of them, ere long, exhibited some humanity; the other was brutal enough to resent even the entreaties made by passers-by that he would not be so hard on the "holy man." Through drenching rain and scorching heat this ruffian hurried the prisoner onward, until they reached Comana in Pontus, near the modern Tokat, where Henry Martyn died in 1812; then passing through the town, they halted about five miles beyond it, at a wayside chapel dedicated to St. Basiliscus, a martyr of Maximin's persecution. The night was passed in the priest's house; next morning Chrysostom, feeling very ill, begged to rest where he was until 11 a.m., but the guards dragged him on some three miles further, until it became evident, even to them, that his strength was at last exhausted. They returned to the little church. Chrysostom, who had tasted no food, changed his clothes, even to his shoes, gave them to some bystanders, and put on white garments as for a day of festival; he then asked for the Holy Eucharist, made his last communion, offered his last prayer, concluding it with the words so familiar to him, and so expressive of his habitual temper, "Glory be to God for all things," and sealed this last doxology with an Amen. Then he stretched out his feet and tranquilly expired, on Saturday, September 14, 407. He had lived about sixty years, and had been bishop for nine years and nearly seven months, when, as Palladius words it, he thus "got clear of the waves."

"I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile,"—the well-known last words of Gregory VII. would have been more appropriate in Chrysostom's case, although he himself would scarcely have so used them. The special interest and impressiveness of the contest in which he became involved, and which actually brought him to his death, are of a kind which should be appreciated by those who profess to feel but little concern in dogmatic controversies, to care only for struggles which represent a moral principle. It was not for his orthodoxy of belief—in fact, as we have seen, his adversaries more than once endeavoured to associate his name with heterodox leanings—but it was for his absolute devotion to high Christian morality, his intense uncompromising hostility to practical abuses and corruptions, especially to self-seeking and secularity among prelates and priests, that this true priest and faithful prelate was thus steadily

and remorselessly hunted down. The story of his episcopate, while it exhibits with peculiar and terrible clearness the force which can be used in an unjust cause, by worldly-minded ecclesiastics, against a spiritual loftiness which has crossed their paths, rebuked their vices, or wounded their pride, is also one of the most noble and inspiring of all testimonies to the moral power of a thoroughly unworldly life and the imperishable fruitfulness of a really saintly example. In the vast throng of devout mourners, gathered from districts neighbouring and remote, who attended that emaciated corpse to its grave beside the martyr Basiliscus,—probably with the wonted funeral chant of “Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee,”—there would be many to remind each other that to one thus “persecuted for righteousness’ sake” belonged the promise of “the kingdom of heaven.” But amid the inevitable sorrow for such a bereavement, and hardly less inevitable depression under the triumph of persecutors who had cast out his name as evil, inflicted on him such cruel suffering, and included his chief friends in the same proscription, there would then be hardly any, even among the most patient or hopeful, who could anticipate the judgment of fourteen centuries on the “Joannite” controversy, and foresee that what had seemed the losing cause would be the cause that had really won, and that the name of John Chrysostom would rank for all time among the greatest of the Church’s saints.

CHAPTER XXXI.

WESTERN AFFAIRS TO THE TAKING OF ROME.

AT the opening of the fifth century, we find the Western Churches enjoying considerable tranquillity, excepting those African dioceses which were liable to frequent disturbance on the part of the Donatist fanatics. Of such troubles we have some evidence in the extant records of the proceedings of no less than six Councils held in the first five years of the new century. The series opens with a Council of the bishops of the proconsular province—"Africa" in the narrower sense—numbered as the fifth Council of Carthage, which was held in the "secretarium" or church-room of the Basilica Restituta on the 16th of June "following the Consulate of Stilicho," *i.e.* in the year 401. Aurelius of Carthage, in his opening address, referred to some prohibition which a recent Council of Italy seems to have made against the ordination of converts from schism or heresy, who had been baptized, when infants, in their respective sects. It would be desirable, he said, to send one of their body of Catholic bishops to represent to "the holy brother Anastasius, bishop of the Apostolic see, and also to the holy brother Venerius, bishop of the Church of Milan," the difficulties caused in Africa by conformity to the rule which had proceeded "from those sees." The African Church was suffering from a scarcity of clergy; many Churches had not even one deacon, however illiterate; there was a still greater lack of men for higher functions, and, as the bishop of Carthage expressed it, there were daily lamentations of various flocks that had almost died out for want of pastors. A former Council, he said, had ruled that persons who had been baptized as infants in Donatism and had in riper years come over to the Church, might, if their character was blameless, be numbered among the Catholic clergy. That this was a right rule, especially in a time of great necessity, "there is

no one," said Aurelius, "who will not grant." The prelates of Rome and Milan might be requested to give their opinion on a further point, whether Donatist pastors who wished to join the Church with their respective congregations, keeping their official rank, might be allowed to do so; but as to the case of laics who were baptized in infancy the Council might be content, at present, to obtain the assent of Rome and Milan to the propriety of admitting them to ordination in the Church. Thus it is clear that the Council of Carthage, while unwilling to take a line which the two great Italian sees had declared to be too lax, was yet fully convinced of the desirableness of that line in their present circumstances and intended to pursue it, after a courteous explanation of the reasons which appeared to them decisive. This is the first canon or resolution of this Council: the second was to the effect that the Government should be memorialised in order to the suppression of idolatry, the remains of which were still rife in many maritime places and on several private estates. The temples also which still stood in country places or remote corners of the land, and so were of no ornament, should be destroyed by imperial authority. The third canon declared that when a case has been ecclesiastically decided, and the unsuccessful party carries it before a civil court, no cleric ought to be compelled to attend such a court as a witness. The fourth illustrates the second by referring to the pagan insolence which sometimes, even on Saints' days and in sacred places, constrained Christians to attend illegal pagan banquets, and insulted Christian morality by licentious dances through streets and public roads. The fifth resolved that the Emperor should be asked to prohibit theatrical spectacles on the Sundays and great holydays: it is asserted that "on the octave of Easter the people frequent the circus rather than the church," and it is further intimated that pressure was brought to bear on members of corporate bodies to enforce their attendance at these performances, "which were contrary to the commands of God." The sixth was to the effect that a cleric condemned by the sentence of bishops ought not to be upheld in his position by his own Church, or by any one whatever. The seventh requested of the Government that an actor who forsook his calling for the sake of Christianity might not be compelled to resume it. The eighth commissioned the Council's legate to ask that manumissions of slaves might be made in African Churches, if the bishops of Italy were found to have this privilege. The ninth renewed or confirmed

a sentence previously passed on a bishop named Equitius: if the legate found him in Italy, he was to act against him according to his discretion.

Another Council was held three months later, on the 13th of September, 401. Letters were read from Pope Anastasius, who seems to have thought that his African brethren were regarding Donatism with too much lenity. While the Council expressed its appreciation of his brotherly interest in African affairs, it resolved to deal gently and in a pacific spirit with the schismatics, but to procure a judicial investigation of the proceedings of the Maximianist party among them, with a view to putting such proceedings on formal record. Letters were to be sent to foreign bishops, but particularly to Anastasius, announcing the intention of the African Church to retain in their official rank, if it seemed good to the local bishop, any Donatist clerics conforming to the Church, any decree of the foreign Churches notwithstanding. A deputation was to be sent to the Donatists to argue with them in behalf of Catholic unity, and to make special use of the now familiar Catholic argument from the quarrel of Primianists and Maximianists: "so as to show them how unrighteously the former, being themselves in schism from the Church, denounced the latter as in schism from themselves." Other canons enforced continence on bishops, priests, and deacons, but not on inferior clergy; forbade the sale of any Church property without consent of the provincial primate; forbade bishops to leave their "principal chairs" and settle at some other church in the diocese, or to neglect their episcopal see by prolonged non-residence. In case of doubt as to a child's baptism, it was ordered (in reply to a question put by Mauritanian bishops) that it should be baptized "without any scruple." The day on which Easter would fall was to be announced by formal letters to all the bishops. A bishop administering a vacant diocese was not to retain it beyond a year. The annual general Council of the African Church was to be held, as settled in the Council of Hippo, on the 23rd of August: the episcopate of each province was to be divided into two or three "bands," each of which was to send deputies, and bishops whose duty it was to attend the Council were not to be absent without good cause. "Defenders" or advocates were to be provided by the Emperor's authority for the afflicted poor against the powerful rich. Priests or deacons deposed were not to have hands laid on them like penitents or ordinary lay Christians—which apparently means that neither by reconciliation

nor by re-ordination could they ever again exercise their ministry. Clerics convicted of crime, but wishing to plead their own cause, "must do so within the year of their excommunication." A bishop was not to take a monk of an "alien" monastery, in order to make him a cleric or a superior of a monastery in his own diocese; nor might he prefer to the Church, as heirs, persons external to his family, or kinsmen who were heretics or pagans, under pain of anathema after death. Altars erected in the country and on the wayside in honour of martyrs, without any relics of martyrs, were to be destroyed, if it could be done without popular tumult; if not, the people were at least to be warned not to frequent them: no martyr-chapel was to be recognised unless it possessed such relics, or was connected by good evidence with a martyr's history, and altars set up in consequence of dreams, or of imaginary revelations to individuals, were to be absolutely disallowed. The right to have slaves manumitted in churches was to be asked for; and the sovereigns were to be solicited to destroy the relics of idolatry "not only in images, but in any sort of places, or groves, or trees." Two cases of misconduct on the part of bishops—one, the neglect of Cresconius to attend the Council; the other, the confusion caused by the deposed Equitius—were the subject of two other canons. It was in accordance with this Council of Carthage that Augustine, writing about the end of the year to a person named Theodorus, protested, as before God, that the Catholic prelates condemned nothing in the Donatists but their schism, and recognised in them all God's gifts, as baptism, ordination, profession of continence, consecration of virgins, belief in the Trinity—gifts, he added, which profited them not, so long as they held them without charity.

In agreement with the rules for meeting fixed by the Council of 401, we find the next African Council held on the 27th of August, 402, at a place which, some years later, became conspicuous in the Pelagian controversy, the Numidian city of Milevum. It was a "general Council of Africa." Aurelius presided, and said in his address that as he had come by "fraternal invitation" he hoped the unanimity of the prelates would be manifested by their subscription to the canons of the Council of Hippo and of the Carthaginian Council of 401. This was agreed to. The first resolution then made was that bishops should take rank according to seniority. Augustine illustrates this canon by a letter to Victorinus, who claimed to be "primate" or chief bishop of Numidia, and in

that capacity had convoked a synod of Numidian and even of Mauritanian bishops: he remarks that the Mauritanians had their own "primates," and urges Victorinus, in the first instance, to let his claims be compared by their fellow-bishops of like standing with those of Xantippus of Tagora, who in fact possessed the better title. It was also ruled that the Numidian church register and archives should be kept both at the "First See"—the see, that is, whose bishop happened to be senior by consecration—and at Cirta or Constantina, the civil capital; and that letters of consecration should be given to each new bishop, carefully drawn up, "containing the consul's name and the day," so as to prevent all disputes about seniority. The rule against transferring clerics from one Church to another was made to apply even to those who had but once discharged the office of Reader. A bishop named Quodvultdeus—names like Quodvultdeus, Adeodatus, or Deogratias, which seem anticipatory of Puritanism, were common in the African Church—had promised to meet his "adversary" before the assembled prelates, but had afterwards declared that he did not choose to do so, and had gone away; it was resolved not to communicate with him until the case was terminated, but it was added that "to take away his episcopate before the result was apparent could not appear just in the eyes of any Christian." An ex-Donatist bishop, Maximian of Bagai (or perhaps of Vaga), who after joining the Church had fallen under some suspicion, offered to resign his bishopric, out of a love, as Augustine says, for Catholic peace: it was resolved that he should formally do so, and that the people should ask for another bishop; and it is interesting to find Augustine exhorting Maximian's brother Castorius to abandon secular prospects, and to accept the bishopric "so gloriously laid down." Such were the proceedings of the first Council of Milevum.

Just a year afterwards, on the 25th of August, 403, another Council met at Carthage, in the basilica "of the second district." The letters of deputation brought by several prelates were examined. It appeared that the bishops of Mauritania Cæsariensis had received the letter of summons too late; but, it was added by the deputies for Mauritania Sitifensis (the westernmost of the Mauritanias), "they will be sure to come, and to approve what may have been done before their arrival." From the recorded words of Alypius of Thagaste, it seems that Xantippus was now the acknowledged primate of Numidia. The single delegate of Tripolis was supposed

to have been delayed by bad weather; it was known that he had embarked. This preliminary business of credentials being despatched, the Council passed two resolutions on the subject of conference with the Donatist bishops. Each prelate, by himself or with a neighbour, was to visit the Donatist bishop of his city, and by the intervention of civil magistrates to request him to join in the necessary steps for a general conference on the merits of the controversy. The form of summoning the Donatists was read and approved. It was conceived in a charitable and brotherly spirit, and alluded to the beatitude respecting the peacemakers.

The same project engaged the attention of a Council held at Carthage in the summer of 404; but it then appeared that the Donatists, instead of responding to the invitation, had "betaken themselves to atrocious violences, so as to lay plots for the destruction of many bishops and clerics, invading some churches, attempting to invade others."

In truth, the ingrained ferocity of African fanaticism, which had, very early in the Donatist struggles, discharged itself on the persons and property of Churchmen, had broken forth anew. Crispinus, Donatist bishop of Calama, about the end of the year 401, had compelled some eighty Catholic slaves on an imperial estate which he held on lease—called Mappala—to be rebaptized; he now replied to the proposal of a conference first by promising to consider it with his colleagues, then by a brief refusal, the pith of which was in the words, "Let the wicked depart from me; I do not choose to know their ways." Ere long a namesake and presbyter of his attacked Possidius, the Catholic bishop, on a visitation tour, broke into the house where he had sought refuge, and dragged him down from an upper chamber. Bishop Crispinus, declining to make any reparation for this outrage, was prosecuted as a heretic, and therefore was liable to a fine; the offence was proved, but the fine was remitted at the intercession of Possidius. A Donatist priest, Restitutus, having come over to the church, was seized by Donatists, beaten, immersed in a muddy pool, dressed up in a garment of rushes, kept a prisoner for twelve days; and a Catholic presbyter, father of a bishop, was so cruelly treated that he died shortly after. But the case which attracted most general commiseration was that of Maximian, bishop of Bagai—a different person from the ex-Donatist already mentioned—who, having established his legal claim to a church at Calvia which had been seized by Donatists, was attacked in that same

church, and had the wooden altar under which he tried to shelter himself broken over his head, and then, wounded with parts of its timber, with clubs, and with cold steel, lay as one dead at the feet of the ruffians, who dragged him along the ground with his face downwards until, as it happened, the dust stanching the blood that flowed from a deep wound in the body. His people managed to take him away, but he was again seized, flung from the top of a tower, carried home by a poor man and his wife, and marvellously brought round, although, as Augustine describes it, he bore the marks of what he had suffered in scars more numerous than his limbs. Augustine himself, who in 402 had written his second book "Against the Epistle of Petilian" of Cirta (the first book having been written in 400), and had then addressed the faithful of his own diocese in a tract "On the Unity of the Church," was attacked by Petilian in a second letter, and answered him in a third book. Petilian had used somewhat violent language, and made such bold assumptions that Augustine in one passage says he might be reduced to straits by the single word, "Prove." In this third book, as in the treatise "On Baptism," Augustine takes the momentous point that the unworthiness of a minister cannot annul the efficacy of sacraments, because the true Agent in sacraments is the invisible Lord, and the minister is merely His organ. He now, as bishop of Hippo, applied to his rival Procleianus as to the proposed conference: but Procleianus refused to take any steps; whereupon Augustine wrote to the Donatist laity, stating the Church's case in the Church's name. He became a mark for the fury of the savage Circumcellions, called by the Donatists "Combatants," the peasant bands which had arrayed slaves and debtors against masters and creditors and upheld Donatism by terrorism and barbarous cruelty; they laid wait for him on his diocesan rounds, and on one occasion, as he himself says in his "Enchiridion," it so happened that he went astray, as he thought, in his journey to a particular place, and did not know until afterwards that an armed force of these ruffians had beset the path which he would otherwise have taken. Thereupon he "rejoiced to have missed his way, and gave thanks to God."

We cannot be surprised that, with such facts before them, the Carthaginian Council of 404 resolved to appeal to the Emperor. But what were they to ask for? Some said, "An absolute prohibition of Donatism; let us demand that the profession

of it be made a crime." "Not so," said others, among whom was Augustine. "Let us only ask, that those who adhere to Catholic unity be protected against these outrages of schismatics by such an application of Theodosius's law against heretical bishops and clergy, which mulcted them in ten pounds of gold, as shall exact that penalty from Donatist bishops or ministers in every place where Donatist violence has inflicted suffering on Churchmen." In this Council of 404, accordingly, two bishops, Theasius and Evodius, were deputed to invoke the Emperor's aid against the Circumcellions, "even as St. Paul made use of military assistance to baffle a conspiracy of factious men." The delegates were to ask for the enforcement of the legal mulct, above referred to, on Donatists against whom Catholics should formally complain of violence or conspiracy; and also for the application to their case of the law which deprived "heretics" of the right to bequeath or to inherit property. Synodal letters to the Emperors and other high civil dignitaries were to be drawn up, together with a commendatory letter for the delegates to the bishop of Rome, or to other bishops near the person of Honorius. The delegates, on arriving at Ravenna, found their sovereign fully aroused by the sight of Maximian's scars and the tale of his sufferings to the necessity of a vigorous interposition. The limited severities which the Council had asked for were considerably less than what the Emperor had resolved upon. It was no question of the mere repression of Donatist outrages: Donatism itself was now to be a crime. On the 12th of February, 405, Honorius published a law (*Nemo Manichæum*) to this effect: "Let no one recall to memory a Manichean, or a Donatist,—which latter sect, as we learn, are especially obstinate in their fury. Let there be one religion, the Catholic." A transgressor of the existing laws against unlicensed sects was to be mulcted; a stirrer-up of tumult was to be punished yet more severely. On the same day with this law, which is known as the "Edict of Union," Honorius, in another law addressed to Hadrian, prætorian prefect of Italy and, as such, in charge of Africa, denounced the Donatist schism as having grown into a heresy by its practice of rebaptizing, which, he added, gave too great encouragement to sinners: he commanded that persons proved to have rebaptized should forfeit all their property; that places where the offence was committed should be confiscated if the owners were parties to it; that slaves escaping from compulsory rebaptism should find protection and emancipation in the

precincts of the church; that persons consenting to rebaptism should be disqualified from giving evidence, acquiring anything by gift, or performing contracts; that officials neglecting to carry out the law should be fined twenty pounds of gold. Donatist bishops and clerics were, Augustine further tells us, made punishable with exile.

Augustine's original sentiment had been unfavourable to such methods. No one, he had once thought, ought to be coerced into Christ's Unity. Argument was the only safe weapon; force would but make hypocritical converts. As late as the Council of 404 he had pleaded for milder measures. But, unhappily, he yielded to the representations which senior bishops made to him as to the good effect of former penal laws. It was represented to him that his native town of Thagaste had been reclaimed from Donatism by such legislation in the reign of Constans, and was now so ardently Catholic that none would believe it to have ever been sectarian. The cases of other cities were quoted in the same sense, as "having been made Catholic by means of the laws of Emperors." So in his ninety-third letter, where he describes this change in his opinions, he says that some Donatists, on conforming to the Church after the promulgation of the new penal law, thanked God for having thereby prevented them from further delay in the execution of a previous resolve. Others said, "Hitherto we had been kept in schism by mere habit." Others, again, professed thankfulness for the salutary stimulus which had urged them to reconsider their position. Others said, "We were previously under misapprehensions which we should never have got rid of but for being forced into conformity." Others, lastly, said that they used to think it did not matter whether they were Churchmen or not, so long as they held the Christian faith; the threatened penalties had enlightened their views as to the religious obligation of Unity. "Those Donatists," he writes in another letter (the 185th), "who were seeking an opportunity to conform, or had been overawed by the fury of the fanatics, or had been withheld by regard for their own friends, passed over at once to the Church:" and the example or persuasion of these first converts soon brought others in their train. "There remained," Augustine proceeds, "a number of stubborn minds, obstinately fixed in that pestilent error." But even of these, very many pretended to join the Church, and this "simulated communion" was often followed by a gradual conviction in her favour.

It is melancholy to think of the consequences which Augustine's adoption of these views—involving, as they did, a confusion between moral and physical pressure, and also between the functions of the spiritual and temporal societies, together with a distinct avowal that persecution carried to a certain extent was sometimes good and righteous—must be deemed to have entailed on Western Christendom. He did much, too much, to lead the Church into a wrong path, to make her accept the world's methods—I quote from Bishop Creighton's "*Persecution and Tolerance*"—and to accept those methods was *pro tanto* to range herself beside it as having like functions, and to ignore her own "divinely appointed" office as the educating and spiritualising force, because that process would take time. As Dr. Mozley strikingly expressed it, the "eye" of the text, "My kingdom is not of this world," was upon her and upon Augustine when he thus departed from "his first and natural convictions;" but he did not take its warning. He earnestly deprecated extreme severities; but his argument would justify any severities short of death as a rightful exercise of worldly power in God's cause, and he had no real safeguard against the extremest form of its application. It is the argument revived by French bishops in support of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and of that systematic "forcing of unwilling souls into the temple" which, when practised by Louis XIV., was solemnly disapproved by no less an authority than Pope Innocent XI.; and in other hands it might be carried to the extremity of *autos da fé*. And yet, while we lament that Augustine gave up his earlier sentiments—the sentiments of Athanasius, Hilary, Martin, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and afterwards of the fourth Toledan synod, and of his namesake of Canterbury and our own king Ethelbert—we must make allowance for the disturbing influence of such an obstinately vexatious and incurable trouble as Donatism then was in the bitter experience of every African Churchman. Many would be prone to think that it could be most effectively dealt with by the roughest treatment; that even the Church might in such a case welcome the assistance of legal terrors, of confiscation and of banishment—if they could not bring themselves to say, of the actual "power of the sword:" and so, instead of claiming that every case of Donatist outrage should be severely punished as an offence against civil order, they took the fatal short-cut method, "Let the sect which breeds these ruffians be itself, as a religious body, placed under a State ban."

The enforcement of the new laws was followed by the appropriation at Carthage of Donatist churches to Catholic worship. Before the same measure had been carried out in other towns, a Council met at Carthage on the 23rd of August, 405, which resolved to make arrangements for a future Council intended to consummate the reunion of Donatists with the Church. Every province was to send delegates with full powers; the magistrates were to be requested to co-operate for the "Reunion," and thanks were to be sent to "the Court" of Ravenna for "the exclusion of the Donatists" from churches. In this Council, also, a letter of Pope Innocent was read, in which he deprecated voyages of bishops to foreign countries except for grave cause. The assembled prelates "affirmed" this opinion. They had hardly broken up their meeting when a fresh outbreak of Circumcellionist fury must have taught Augustine that rigorous penalties might exasperate where they failed to intimidate; for we are told both in his book against Cresconius, and in a letter written in the name of the clergy of Hippo to a Donatist bishop named Januarius, that the fierce agents of Donatist clerics proceeded, after the edicts, to worse excesses than before. They attacked the houses of Catholic clergy by night, doubtless yelling out their war-cry of "*Laudes Deo!*" dragged forth the inmates, beat and wounded them, poured lime into their eyes, and afterwards, on finding that this was not sufficient to ensure blindness, "added vinegar." These enormities were accompanied by the pillaging and burning of the houses; stores of grain were carried off, liquid stores poured out on the ground; nothing was heard but furious threats of which the burden was "killing, burning, blinding." Sometimes these menaces, as we learn from a somewhat later letter, scared unhappy Catholics into submitting to be rebaptized: sometimes the desperate fanatics committed suicide in order to discredit the cause of their opponents. The reason of this outbreak in the diocese of Hippo was mainly hatred of Augustine, as the great pillar of "the Traditors' Church;" and he sent a letter by the hands of a presbyter to Cæcilian, whom he entitles "president" or provincial governor, entreating him to extend to Hippo the benefits of his official vigour against the schism. But it was not in that district only that the Circumcellions raged at the end of 405. At Bagai they burned the church and its sacred books; at Cirta they broke in pieces the altars; at one place in Numidia four basilicas were destroyed; at Cæsariana carriages full of church stores were taken

away. Similar violences were perpetrated in defence of Donatist churches about to be claimed for, and given over to, the Catholics: in some cases, naturally enough, the perpetrators came into collision with the Government forces, and those of them who were slain were deemed martyrs by their brethren in fanaticism. "But," say the clergy of Hippo, "whenever *we* get hold of any of your people, we preserve them unharmed with all tenderness, we talk to them, we read them everything that can convince them of the error which parts brothers from brothers; and so some of them, considering the clearness of truth and the beauty of peace, are united by us, not to the baptism which, as a king's stamp, they had already, while deserters, received, but to the faith which was lacking to them, to the charity of the Holy Spirit, to the Body of Christ!" In this beautiful context it is added that Donatists who refused to conform were dismissed in safety; that Catholic laymen were entreated to do them no hurt; that sometimes this entreaty was successful, but sometimes they were dealt with as robbers, received the blows which they would have inflicted, were given over (despite the pleadings of clergy) to the magistrates for punishment.

The Donatist bishops now resolved to send a deputation to the court; and accordingly some of them appeared at Ravenna on the 30th of January, 406, and demanded, on their part, a conference for the settlement of the controversy. For this purpose, they asked to be heard in a formal discussion with a Catholic bishop named Valentinus, then at the court; but the prætorian prefect could not grant this, nor could Valentinus have met them without a commission from his brethren. So ended, for the present, the business of this compulsory "Reunion:" we shall have to return, ere long, to the history of the Donatist struggles, and observe the later demonstrations of sectarian animosity against the African Church.

The death of Anastasius of Rome and the succession of Innocent I. had taken place in the spring of 404, when the political situation of the Western empire—or, more strictly, of the western half of the empire—was sufficiently critical to awaken grave anxiety for the safety even of the Roman City itself. Some years before, Alaric the Goth had overrun Greece; Honorius had sent the aid of his great general Stilicho to a country which could not rely on its own sovereign; but Arcadius himself had insisted that Stilicho should send his Eastern troops back to Constantinople,

and compliance with this demand had produced the murder of Rufinus. Arcadius afterwards tried to make Alaric harmless by investing him with the chief command in Eastern Illyricum; and there, seated on the verge of two realms, in what Dr. Hodgkin calls his "eyrie," he could bide his time until he saw his opportunity for swooping down on Italy in 401. He threatened, but did not take, "the virgin-fortress" of Aquileia: he paused on the road to Rome, turned westwards towards Milan, and thereby terrified Honorius and his courtiers into discussing whether they should not abandon Italy. From this extremity of self-humiliation the Emperor saved himself by taking refuge behind the impassable marshes which girdled Ravenna, his home for the rest of his pitiful life. This retreat took place in the latter part of 402, some months after the repulse of the Goths by Stilicho at Pollentia on Easter-day of that year. But was the repulse decisive? That is uncertain: more likely the Gothic host remained intact, at least was not seriously defeated, and was practically allowed to retire beyond the Alps.

The campaign was followed by a visit of Honorius to Rome, when the august puppet was hailed, in the poet Claudian's phrase, as the "present genius of the Empire," and applauded for not allowing the senators "to walk before his car." The clergy, no doubt, were conspicuous amid the "waves of population" that filled the streets; and their prayers would be mingled with the shouts that welcomed the solemn opening of the sixth consulate of their Emperor. Honorius resided at Rome until the end of July, 404; and his visit was memorable for a greater victory than that of Pollentia—the victory of the Christian spirit over one of the most odious barbarities of paganism. Years before, Alypius the friend of Augustine, while a law-student at Rome, had been overcome by the hideous fascination of that gladiatorial "spectacle" which Cicero, in his "Tusculan Disputations," had placidly described as "thought by some people to be cruel and inhuman, and possibly deserving that character." The young African, forcibly led to the Colosseum by his fellow-students, had at first closed his eyes and averted his thoughts from that savage "Roman holiday:" but a wild shout of applause was too much for his curiosity; he opened his eyes, he saw the blood flowing; "forthwith he drank in the savage spirit, the brutal frenzy" of those around him; "he gazed, he shouted, he carried home with him the passion for those bloody games, and drew

others on " to enjoy them like himself. Prudentius, the Spanish Christian poet, describes the Vestals as bending their consecrated eyes on that scene of horror, and joining in the fatal signal which sacrificed the fallen combatant's life. And he concludes his poem "Against Symmachus," written about the year 403, by conjuring Honorius to abolish "that ghastly rite:" "Let no one so die within the city as by his sufferings to furnish its people with amusement!" The games were held in honour of the new imperial consul, with all possible magnificence; the gladiatorial fights were not omitted; but an Eastern monk, named Telemachus, suddenly sprang into the arena, and tried to separate the combatants. He was instantly pelted to death by the infuriated spectators; but a reaction of feeling soon recognised in his self-devotion the true glory of a martyrdom "in the cause of humanity," and acquiesced in the edict by which Honorius for ever abolished the gladiatorial shows of Rome.

But the check given to the Christian Alaric was followed in 405 by the more terrible approach of a savage heathen chief, who had joined Alaric in his former invasion, and was now returning as the leader of a miscellaneous following of northern barbarians, among whom Goths were foremost. Radagaisus "passed without resistance the Alps, the Po, and the Apennine:" he besieged Florence, and while Stilicho was preparing to relieve it, the Christians and the pagans of Rome would be incessantly speculating on the possibilities of escape from the last extremities of humiliation and suffering. He was "the fiercest foe that had ever menaced the City:" he had vowed to devote every Roman to his gods: the terror of the pagan citizens naturally took the form of bitter complaint against the dominant Christianity, which had drawn down this peril on a city where the gods had been denied. Only a year or two before, Prudentius had boasted of six hundred patrician families as converted from idolatry, had described the common people as thronging to "the tomb on the Vatican," or seeking for the "sacred sign" at the Lateran, and had triumphantly asked whether any one could doubt that Rome had accepted the "laws of Christ." Yet now, in the vivid language of the "History" of Orosius, another Spanish writer of this period, who will meet us again in connection with the Pelagian controversy, "the whole city rang with blasphemies; the pagans denounced the name of Christ as the pest of the day." Or, as Augustine expresses it, they spread abroad the notion that an invader who

daily appeased the gods with victims was advancing under their patronage, and could not be beaten back by those who had proscribed the ancient worship. But, in fact, he was not only beaten back; he was surrounded within a large entrenchment, ultimately taken prisoner, and as a matter of course put to death. The united tribes which followed Radagaisus lost a third or more of their number in his catastrophe.

If we place ourselves in thought at Rome, among the ecclesiastical circles that surrounded Pope Innocent about the end of that year 405, and ask what were the main subjects that interested Roman Churchmen, we shall probably give a chief place among them to the affair of St. Chrysostom, which was, in the eyes of the great "apostolic Church," a question, as Milman says, between "persecuted holiness" and a combination of malignant intrigues. Nor can we fail to acknowledge that "the defenders of Chrysostom were so clearly on the side of justice, humanity, generous compassion for the oppressed, as well as of ecclesiastical order, that the bishop of Rome could not but rise in the general estimation of Christendom." In another direction, the growing intimacy of the relations between the Roman see and the Gallic and Spanish Churches, as well as the growing extension of Roman canon law, are illustrated by a series of documents emanating from Rome in the earlier years of Innocent's episcopate. Some dissensions and disorders in the Spanish hierarchy, caused in part by neglect of the rule as to a careful probation of bishops-elect—insomuch that men were transferred at once from the bar, or from civil office, or from "curial" functions, to the episcopate—and partly by the refusal of some bishops to communicate with penitent ex-Priscillianists, drew forth from the Pope a grave and earnest exhortation. Again, he received several inquiries from some Gallic bishops, and returned a synodical reply. Some of the questions referred to the duties of persons in holy orders. They were bound, said the Roman Synod, in consequence of their continuous sacramental functions, to observe perpetual continence. Bishops ought to be thoroughly united in faith: "for we read, One is my dove, one is my perfect one." In the Paschal season priests and deacons might, "even in the bishop's presence, give remission of sins, and fulfil their ministry," by baptizing: out of that season, "a priest might baptize a person dangerously sick, but no such licence is found to have been granted to deacons." If deacons have ever baptized in such circumstances, necessity may excuse

the act, but it must not be repeated. No one ought to be made a bishop unless he is first made a cleric: "For it is written," says the canon, in the spirit of the Sardican Council, "'And let these be first proved;' else, why does the apostle forbid a 'neophyte' to be ordained?" A bishop who forsakes his own church, and takes possession of another, should be deposed. Clerics excommunicated by their own bishop ought not to be received even to lay communion elsewhere; a prelate who violated this rule, by receiving or "promoting" such a cleric, "must know himself to be severed from the society of Catholics, and to be incapable of the communion of the apostolic see." No bishop ought to "overpass his own bounds, and celebrate ordinations" in another diocese, or hinder the metropolitan from ordaining a bishop (in conjunction with neighbouring prelates) within his diocese. No bishop ought to ordain as clerics any laymen excommunicated by their own bishop. In regard to other points, the Roman Canons ruled that a consecrated virgin who had fallen, and concealed her sin under a pretence of marriage, must be put to penance; that one not consecrated, but known to have purposed so to remain, must be similarly punished for a clandestine marriage; that some restriction—the text does not clearly say what—must be put on Churchmen who have served in the army, considering the moral dangers of a military life; that no one ought to aspire to the clerical state who after baptism has fallen into impurity; that no one should marry his deceased wife's sister, or an uncle's wife, or a first cousin, or have a concubine beside his wife; that no one who has exercised secular power ought to enter the clergy except after a time of penance, apparently because he might have had to inflict death. These rules were closed by an assurance that if they were carefully observed, "God would not be offended, nor schisms nor heresies produced, but the Gentiles would say that God was truly in us, even Christ our Lord."

Two other letters were answers to questions put by two individual Gallic prelates, Victricius of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse. Writing to Victricius in 404 or 405, Innocent delivered his mind on thirteen points, appealing in some cases to Nicene rules, but taking care to magnify the Roman Church, and to cite the "synod" which gave it an appellate jurisdiction, implying clearly that this synod was the Nicene, whereas in fact it was the Sardican. Of these regulations may be specially mentioned the first, which declared it unlawful for one bishop to ordain another

as his successor, "lest the benefit bestowed should appear clandestine;" the third, which claimed for Rome "in greater causes" an authority paramount to a tribunal of bishops, words which suggested that Rome herself was to judge which causes were "greater,"—a suggestion not warranted by the Sardican canons; the sixth, which, in defining digamy, took account of a marriage contracted before baptism; the ninth, on clerical continence; the eleventh, on the undesirableness of ordaining a person liable to municipal requirements. On this last matter Innocent could speak from experience, having had to entreat the Emperor for the exemption of such "curiales" from the sore burdens which their birth laid upon them, and from which they had hoped their clerical state would relieve them—whereas Theodosius had ruled that no born "curialis" ordained since 388 should be freed from his obligations except on condition of renouncing his patrimony. Exuperius, like Victricius, had consulted Innocent on certain points, and received an answer dated February 20, 405. In this letter Innocent repeats the then established Roman maxim as to clerical continence, but allows that any priests or deacons, hitherto unaware of the rule laid down by "the bishop Siricius," may, on promising to observe it for the future, retain their offices, but must not aspire to any higher post. As to the case of baptized men who after a profligate life entreat both "penance" and Communion, the old strict rule, says Innocent, would have granted them penance only; but now, in times of peace, and as a protest against Novatian rigour, it is usual to give such persons Communion "as a viaticum." Exuperius had also asked what Innocent thought of Christians being judges, and so called upon to inflict death; and was told that the fathers had determined nothing on this point, but had owned judicial power to be given by God. Another question was as to the guilt of adultery; was it really greater in women than in men? The answer is, No, but more patent. Divorce followed by "marriage" is pronounced to constitute adultery, and to entail excommunication; which explains the penance undergone by Jerome's friend Fabiola on an Easter-eve at the Lateran, for having married a second husband after divorcing the first for his vices. A list of "Canonical books" is given, which agrees with that of the third Council of Carthage, admitting Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees; and "not only rejects but condemns" apocryphal writings bearing the names of Matthias, James the Less, Peter, John, Andrew, Leucius, or "Xenocharis and Leonidas, philosophers."

And the Church of Gaul herself—how was she doing her work in the early years of that century which was to witness at its close the establishment of the so-called “Christian kingship” of Clovis? On the 23rd of September, 401, a Council was held at Turin—it is interesting to find bishops from Gaul meeting beyond the Alps—in order to settle some Gallican disputes. Proculus of Marseilles was to be the chief bishop of the Second Narbonensian province, not, as he contended, in right of his see, but solely as a personal distinction on the ground of his character. The Churches of Arles and Vienne were at strife then—as long afterwards—about precedency; it was to be settled by ascertaining which of the two cities was the metropolis; and it was further ordered that each of them should claim authority over the cities nearest it within the province. Consecrations of bishops contrary to the canons were to be annulled, and the consecrator was to have no further right in consecrations or in synods. Two special cases of episcopal judgment were confirmed. With reference to the scandal caused by the Ithacian persecutors of Priscillian, it was decided that any bishops who broke off from communion with Felix of Treves (the Ithacians’ friend) were to be received into fellowship, according to letters of bishop Ambrose of venerable memory and of the bishop of the Roman Church, which had been read in the Council. The last canon forbade persons who, while in the lower ministries, had had children, to be advanced to the higher orders.

But the questions of routine and discipline, appeals from episcopal decisions or disputes about episcopal jurisdiction, such as come up for settlement at a Council, would give us, if taken alone, a very untrue or at least imperfect picture of episcopal life and character. The Gallic Church of these early years of the fifth century could point to many saintly names among her bishops. She had, indeed, lost a few years before her greatest saint by the death of Martin, and somewhat later she had seen her southern districts deprived of the pious energy of the holy Delphinus of Bordeaux. But Delphinus’s successor, Amandus, was himself afterwards canonized. Another good bishop was Simplicius, who at his ancient city of Autun, once a seat of learning for well-born Gaulish youths, succeeded in overthrowing the “riotous” worship of Cybele, which in the second century had been repudiated by the young noble Symphorianus at the cost of his life. Of Innocent’s two correspondents, the one, Victricius, after beginning life as a

soldier, had suffered cruel usage for abandoning his military employment, had become acquainted with Martin, had been made bishop of Rouen, and in that office had spread the faith of Christ through the "remotest part of the Nervian territory," planting monasteries, building churches, collecting relics of saints, making Rouen illustrious among Christian cities. He had visited Rome, apparently by way of defending himself against some charge of heterodoxy; and it was after his return home that he had written to Innocent for further information on questions of discipline. Exuperius was bishop of another famous city, the name of which in old times had made "gold of Toulouse" an equivalent for ill-gotten gains, and in which, according to Hilary, Constantius had ill-treated the clergy and insulted the Holy Sacrament. He was a man of singular beauty of character, whom Jerome, writing somewhat later, described as "imitating the Lord's poverty that he might become rich, and that by him the Lord might be daily welcomed, fed, and clothed; as hungry himself while feeding others; as carrying the Lord's Body in a wicker basket and His Blood in a glass; as having overthrown the seats of simonists without the use of small cords or rebukes." Exuperius was ere long to mourn over the desolation brought on Aquitania, Novempopulania, and his own Narbonensis, by the Vandal invasion of 405-406; although Toulouse, when Jerome alluded to these miseries five years later, had not yet fallen, being preserved, as he believed, by the sanctity of Exuperius. In Northern Gaul Desiderius, bishop of Langres, is supposed to have been slain amid these ravages, and Nicasius, bishop of Reims, with his sister and two clerics, to have fallen under Vandal swords at the gates of his own church.

But before the dark time set in of the invasions which destroyed the Roman rule in the countries beyond the Alps, the Church of Gaul had heard something of a new movement against prevalent observances and opinions which might in some respects recall Jovinianism. Vigilantius, a native of southern Gaul, who in youth had sold wine at an inn, and then became a priest, had been on intimate terms with Paulinus, afterwards bishop of Nola, had travelled into Palestine, and had brought back with him to Europe from his Syrian sojourn a temper of sensitive orthodoxy against Origenism, representing even Jerome as unsound because he had read Origen's works. Recollecting the subsequent course of that controversy, one is struck by the strangeness of the position in which Jerome was thus placed by one whom he

was afterwards to denounce with tenfold asperity. He replied to Vigilantius, in 396, partly in a tone of lofty contempt, partly by a serious explanation of the distinction which he, for his part, drew between the sound and unsound parts of Origen's writings. Years passed away, and it was in 404, after the cessation of his own fierce wrangle with Rufinus, that Jerome heard of Vigilantius again. A Gallic priest, Riparius, told him that his former critic was now speaking against Church vigils, and denouncing those who venerated martyrs' relics as idolaters and "worshippers of ashes." Jerome instantly wrote back that Vigilantius (or, as he styled him, Dormitantius) was no better than a Jew or Samaritan. As for "worshipping" martyrs' relics, "we do not worship Angels or Archangels or Cherubim or Seraphim or any name that is named in this world or in the world to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than the Creator. But we do honour the relics of martyrs, that we may adore Him whose martyrs they are." "Impure ashes? Were the ashes or bones of patriarchs impure?" He referred to the general custom of venerating martyrs' tombs; and, adverting to the subject of vigils, quoted "Could ye not watch one hour?" He expressed surprise that "the bishop in whose diocese Vigilantius dwelt had not broken the unprofitable vessel with an apostolic rod of iron," and made a sort of explanation of his own virulence by assuming that "zeal like his was piety towards God," and not really harshness towards man.

While he wrote thus hotly, this vehement censor had not even read Vigilantius's book. Two years afterwards it was sent to him; he fell upon it in hot haste, and sat up one whole night dictating his reply. Here is a sample of his felicitousness as a controversialist: "Many a monster has the world bred: we read of centaurs and sirens, of onocrotali in Isaiah, of Behemoth and Leviathan in Job; poets sing of Cerberus, the chimæra, the hydra; Spain produced the triple-formed Geryon; but Gaul never bred a monster before." Then comes the old pun on Vigilantius, as in truth a Dormitantius, a vulgar sneer at him as a wine-seller, an utterance of disgust at fallen bishops who share his guilt, if bishops they are who ordain no deacons that are not married! Vigilantius's words are quoted: "Why honour, or rather adore, and kiss some dust wrapt in a rich cloth, carried in a little vessel?" Emphatically repudiating the notion of worshipping martyrs, Jerome rushes to the assumption that Vigilantius would like

their remains flung out on dunghills, and refers to Constantius's translation of the remains of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, and to Arcadius's recent reception of relics of Samuel. Vigilantius had affirmed that the martyrs were actually in paradise, or "under the altar," and could not be supposed, as he tersely puts it, to "fly round their own ashes; while they were safe in a home of rest and light, they would not be present near their sepulchres." How, asks Jerome, can he be sure of that? *Tu Deo leges pones?* May they not, as they follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, have a presence of some kind here on earth? But Vigilantius, relying on an apocryphal book of Esdras (which Jerome had never even troubled himself to read, because the Church had not received it), affirmed that after death intercession was useless, and added that the martyrs in the Apocalypse, when praying for the avenging of their blood, received no answer. To speak disrespectfully of the bodies in which holy souls had dwelt was to offend Christian feeling, and Jerome traces such language to the heresiarch Eunomius; he adds that to deny the intercessory activity of such souls is virtually to deny their present condition as living to God; and if, when still in the body, they could pray for others, how much more now, as crowned and triumphant? Somewhat later, he refers to the offering of the Eucharist by the Roman bishop over the bones of Peter and Paul. Turning to another point, namely, Vigilantius's criticism of the lighting of huge tapers at martyrs' shrines as the introduction of a pagan custom into churches, Jerome makes a cautious distinction: "We do not," he says, "light candles in the daytime, but during the night-vigil; but *if* some devout persons have lighted them in the daytime in honour of martyrs, what harm is done?" Is it worse than the lavish expenditure of ointment which Christ Himself defended from blame? And apart from all references to relics, "throughout the Orient"—meaning Syria—"lamps are lit when the Gospel is to be read, although the sun may be shining; not, therefore, of course, to dispel darkness, but simply as a token of joy." Then as to night-vigils: Vigilantius would restrict them to Easter-eve, to which Jerome answers, "You might as well say, Do not celebrate the Resurrection on every Sunday" (this reminds one of Keble's line, "An Easter-day in every week"), "but only on Easter-day." But Vigilantius laid stress on the moral disorders even then caused by this observance—disorders which afterwards required its abolition. Jerome answers by admitting that such

abuses did exist, but contending that they did not "take away the use." Passing over Vigilantius's objection to the frequent singing of Alleluia, we may notice his criticism of the stories of miracles wrought at martyr-shrines: such signs, he said (by an adaptation of 1 Cor. xiv. 22), could be a sign for non-believers only; believers could not want them. Jerome answers, "If they are wrought, and if they are of service to any minds, that is enough;" and then, by one of his sudden bounds into a coarseness that was in fact brutality—such as his assumption that Vigilantius's dislike of fasts meant a fear that his old business would suffer—he says that Vigilantius must be inspired by an indwelling demon, whom these sacred relics had tormented: for his own part, he owned that whenever he had been angry, or had entertained an evil thought, he trembled all over at the very idea of visiting the tomb of a martyr. Perhaps Vigilantius might laugh at this as mere womanish superstition—so be it; *he* would take his portion with the women who first saw the Risen Lord. He had been informed that Vigilantius deprecated the sending of alms to the pious residents at Jerusalem, and advocated rather a graduated and measured almsgiving in every Churchman's own neighbourhood; after some remarks on this point, he dealt finally with Vigilantius's argument against the multiplication of monasteries: "If all rush into such retreats, who will be left to form Churches, win over men of the world, exhort sinners to repentance?" and his main answer is that such exceptional virtue as that of the monk, whose office is not to teach, but to mourn for sin and wait for the Lord's coming, will always be rare; that if it be best to keep one's place in the world and fight against its evil, Vigilantius may be strong enough for such a combat, but he, Jerome, is "conscious of his infirmity."

Such was this coarse and violent, yet in some respects powerful, tract against Vigilantius: it is marred by Jerome's incurable vulgarity and bitterness, not to say by his occasional irrelevance or even sophistry; but it exhibits clearly enough the position taken up by Vigilantius. Undoubtedly the latter hit some blots, and had serious grounds for deprecating or criticizing some excesses of popular religious enthusiasm, which had been largely fostered by the influence of superficial conversions; yet he seems, like Jovinian, to have been carried on to lengths which could not but be repugnant even to calmer and fairer minds than that of their common enemy. Vigils might sometimes be perverted; the

veneration for a martyr's body might too easily become superstitious ; monasticism might often deprive the Church of forces that should have helped her to leaven society ; the prevalent Western ideas as to clerical life might often be an occasion of moral danger, as those bishops felt who, sympathizing with Vigilantius, went so far as to think that celibacy was unsafe and to ordain those only who had married beforehand ; yet Vigilantius allowed himself to speak in a way that shocked some deep instincts of Christian awe and tenderness, and marred his chances of influence by hurrying, or being goaded, into the falsehood of one extreme, while Jerome took up his ground in the other.

The pamphlet against Vigilantius was written in 406, soon after the close of a remarkable correspondence between Jerome and Augustine, in which each of them, it appears, maintained convincingly the point on which he was right, and abandoned ultimately that on which he was wrong. Two questions were raised, the one certainly the more important for practical Christianity, but the other intimately connected with the Church's duty as the "keeper" of Holy Writ. 1. Was Jerome right in undertaking a new translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, instead of being contented to revise, by means of Origen's Hexapla, the Latin version from the Septuagint? 2. Was Augustine right in exhorting Jerome not so to interpret the narrative of St. Paul "withstanding" St. Peter as to make the Scriptures of truth sanction pious frauds? In this correspondence, Augustine showed his superiority in moral perception and good temper, although on the question of translation his opinion was worth little in comparison with that of the great Biblical scholar who had so laboriously made that subject his own. Jerome might be, and indeed was, vehement against the obvious and straightforward interpretation of the occurrence at Antioch, and paradoxically regardless of the clear distinction between such dissimulation as Paul was said to have rebuked, and that indulgence to Jewish observances which in some cases he displayed. He might be, and he was, too ready to call what in fact would be, as Augustine bluntly termed it, a "mendacium," by the smooth and too often seductive term "economy." He might be peevish, satirical, ill-tempered, in contrast to the courtesy and tenderness exhibited towards him by one who in this dispute has been well said to have proved himself—what Jerome never was—a true gentleman. He might show, in those frequent allusions to his "poor little cottage,"

to his corner of a cell, not a little of "the pride that apes humility." But he was on his own ground, and invincible, when he firmly upheld the propriety, the necessity, of "letting the Christian world know what the Hebrew Verity contained," instead of taking any Greek version, however venerable, however honoured, as the ultimate standard for students of the Old Testament. There might be, there must be, in such a process some disturbance of cherished associations; annoyance might find excitable utterance, as in the congregation which a bishop offended by reading the story of Jonah in Jerome's version, which substituted "hedera" for the familiar "cucurbita:" his new translation might be angrily censured by incompetent judges whom, after his fashion, he repeatedly denounces as "jealous detractors," and compares to "barking" or "worrying" dogs, remarking that everybody, whether he has studied the subject or not, assumes that he is an expert in "the art of dealing with Holy Scripture." Irritable as he was, he sometimes answers these critics with calm dignity: "If you think I have made a mistake in my translation, ask the Hebrews instead of worrying the translator: as they decide, let my version be trusted or mistrusted. I have at least some slight knowledge of Hebrew, and anyhow I can write Latin." "Let those who choose, read my version; let those who do not choose, put it aside." He had to defend himself against the charge of disparaging the Septuagint: it was important to break down the superstition as to its infallibility, but he explained that he had taken the trouble to revise its text, and that he often used it in giving addresses. Another service that he rendered was the distinction sharply drawn between the Old Testament proper and the books (such as *Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Judith*, etc.) which were not properly canonical, although read in church (as our Sixth Article quotes him) for the edification of the people, but not for the confirmation of Church doctrines. On the whole his Bible-work was at once laborious and invidious, but it was work which had to be done as a matter of fidelity to the sacred books themselves, and thereby to the Church and her individual members; and his resolute will and immense perseverance were employed to carry it through, and to earn for him, as Bishop Lightfoot says, "the universal gratitude of after ages."

Augustine had "burdens" enough on him to make all controversy that was not unavoidable an utter weariness. Beside the apparently endless debate about Cæcilian and Majorinus, Primian and Maximian, "communicating with successors of Traditors" and

“ignoring the judgment of Councils and of the whole Church,” he had been within the last few years reminded of his old Manichean days by the necessity of discussing Manichean doctrines with Felix, one of the leaders of the sect which had formerly found its ablest representative in Faustus. The discussion—the second of its kind which Augustine had held, for he had met and confuted Fortunatus in 393—took place in the cathedral of Hippo on Wednesday, December 7, 404, after some preliminary challenge on the part of Felix to the effect that he would uphold all that was found in the writings of Manes. The people stood, in perfect stillness, below the chancel: the Manichean “Epistle of the Foundation” was produced, and owned by Felix; and he made a strikingly plain admission that the attraction of Manicheism lay mainly in its offer of physical knowledge as to “beginning, middle, and end, the structure of the world, the causes of day and night,”—information not given in the Apostolic writings, and convincing him that Manes was the Paraclete. Another curious point was the notion that possessed the mind of Felix, as to there being necessarily implied in Christian doctrine the existence of an evil essence, independent of and hostile to God; a notion which gives point to Augustine’s frequent assertion that evil has no “substantive” existence, is in fact a negation—an attractive theory, but one which offers no real solution of this terrible *crux*. Augustine replied that men were God’s creatures, whom Christ came to deliver from their sins. Felix asked to have the debate adjourned until Monday, December 12, and agreed to be accounted “vanquished,” if he fled before that time. He duly appeared on the day, and Augustine demonstrated the strict connexion between the notion of moral responsibility and the Christian doctrines of Creation and Freewill. He quoted a passage in which Manes himself had spoken of a “refusal to keep God’s law:” this involved freewill, as opposed to the figment of compulsion by “the race of darkness.” He insisted on the vast difference between what was of God’s essence, and what was literally of His creation; between “belonging to God,” as the soul did, and being “part of Him,” as it was regarded according to Manicheism, which, like other forms of Pantheism, immersed part of its Deity in moral defilement. At last, after being warned that no one thought of “forcing him to become a Christian” (in the Church’s sense of the word), Felix gave in, asking Augustine to write a form of anathema against “the spirit which spoke by Manes.” It was written, and he wrote a yet fuller form; and both

"signed the minutes." Out of this debate, it seems, grew another anti-Manichean treatise, "On the Nature of Good," in which Augustine maintained the unique essential goodness of the Creator, the impassable distinction between it and all created goodness, the true causation of sin as an outcome of created beings' abuse of their free agency; and, after exposing some of the abominations which lay embedded in the Manichean theory of the universe, he concluded by a prayer for the deluded heretics, which resembles our third Collect for Good Friday. Then followed a controversy between him and Secundinus, a Manichean "auditor," who had read some of Augustine's writings against his sect, admired his eloquence, but accused him, in an extant letter, of having abandoned Manicheism (so far as he had ever known it) from selfish motives, and exhorted him to return to a "spiritual" and un-Judaical belief. To this letter Augustine replied in 405, by a short treatise "Against Secundinus," of which he says that he thinks it much the best of all his attacks upon "that plague."

The African Church had indeed a variety of troubles in the years next following that of the "Reuniting Edict." Some of these are apparent in the acts of the "eleventh" Council of Carthage, held on the 13th of June, 407. It was then resolved to ask the Emperor to appoint "defenders" or professional advocates for the various Churches (analogous to the existing "defenders" of the towns) who should be empowered to support Church interests, *e.g.* by resisting those who were adverse to the Church, and should for any needful purpose have access to "the cabinets of the judges." A regulation was made as to the position of ex-Donatist bishops: if they had brought over their flocks before the edict, they were still to govern them; if afterwards, the general rule must apply to them—the Catholic bishop must rule all the people and administer all the Church property. Two other decrees of this synod are observable. One of them renewed a canon of the Council of Hippo, giving it a fuller wording, to the effect that the "prayers, or prefaces" (*i.e.* introductory exhortations to prayer on the special subject of the day's service, known in the Spanish rite as *missæ* or *orationes missæ*) "or commendations" (prayers for the departed) "or forms of imposition of hands," which had been approved in Council, should be used by all, and that "none contrary to the faith should be used, but such only as had been collected by prudent men." The other decree implicitly referred to the case of Chrysostom, whose cause had been espoused

by archbishop Aurelius—"as to the dissension between the Roman and Alexandrian Churches, let the holy pope Innocent be written to, in the interest of Christian peace."

This resolution was passed three months before the death of Chrysostom. Two months after it, on November 15, 407, Honorius made a law enacting that all imperial favours to the Church should be notified to the magistrates by means of lay "Advocates" chosen by the clergy; but the "priests of the provinces," *i.e.* the bishops, were to see that this new privilege did not turn to the Church's disadvantage. A few days later, November 24, 407, he enacted that temples (the destruction of which he had already prohibited) should be deprived of their property, that images wherever remaining should be torn from their places, altars destroyed, banquets in honour of idols forbidden: the bishops were to carry out this law by the help of a police force at their disposal called the "Church band." The decree (afterwards reissued in shorter form, November 15, 408) was published at Carthage on June 5, 408, just after a fresh demonstration of pagan audacity. "An insolent troop of dancers," as Augustine expresses it, passed before the gate of the church of Calama in Numidia, during the pagan festival of the Kalends of June. Some clerics tried to stop the scandal: the pagans replied by hurling stones at the church; and after eight days, when the bishop had notified the recent enactment (which, Augustine says, was "very well known"), the clergy demanded to be heard before the local magistrates, and to have their representations put on record. This was refused: a new attack was made, the church-houses were fired, a monk was killed, and the bishop only just saved himself by resorting to a hiding-place where he could hear fierce voices exclaiming, "All's done to no purpose, since *he* is not to be found." This went on from 4 p.m. till late at night; no person in authority dared to interfere: the fact was that the whole city sympathized with the rioters. But when Augustine came to console or soothe the Christians, the pagans were scared and humble. They asked to see the powerful prelate of Hippo, and he took occasion from their present anxiety as to the results of the outbreak to discourse on their religious danger. They listened, they made an apology, they procured the intercession of one of their best citizens, an elderly pagan gentleman named Nectarius, who wrote to beg that the outrage, grave as it undoubtedly was, might not be avenged by any forfeiture of life. In this letter he used Theistic language, and even reminded Augustine that a

Christian bishop was by his own profession interested in saving life and accustomed to beseech "God" for the pardon of offenders. Augustine replied as to an "honoured brother," commending his correspondent's patriotism, putting in a few words about the heavenly country, suggesting that social virtues were best exhibited in the Christian society, and disclaiming any wish for a severer penalty than such a fine as would leave the criminals a livelihood, while withdrawing what they had misused. Nectarius, somewhat later, presumed on the courteous and humane tone of this reply by first hinting, in Symmachus's fashion, that various ways "led alike to the heavenly city," and then requesting that not even any loss of property might be inflicted on his clients. This, of course, was too much: Augustine answered, in effect, "You must have forgotten what I wrote: there is no question of vindictive treatment, nor of such exactions as would involve beggary; but the Church must require some penalty to be imposed, and the lightest that is possible is the forfeiture of superfluous wealth."

Before the outrage at Calama was a fortnight old, a Council of Carthage had deputed a bishop to address Honorius on the subject of pagan and Donatist outbreaks. The delegate, however, found on his arrival that a great change had taken place in the government. Stilicho's policy had been ambiguous, though if he carried on any "diplomatic dallyings" with Alaric, it was, Professor Bury considers, with a view to the recovery of Eastern Illyricum for the Western empire. But he had been undermined in Honorius's regard and confidence by a crafty intriguer of whom Augustine thought much too well, Olympius, now the chief officer of the palace. Both Christians and pagans, on different grounds, disliked the great commander; and Honorius was led to suspect him of a scheme for placing his son Eucherius on the throne of the East, on which Arcadius had just been succeeded by the boy Theodosius II. (May 1, 408). Much of Roman feeling was hostile to Stilicho as a barbarian; a mutiny revealed discontent under the strict discipline which his strong hand had established. A Goth named Sarus nearly got possession of his person at Bologna; he repaired to Ravenna, heard that he was to be arrested, took sanctuary in a church, was induced by perjury to leave it, and then, by his ungrateful master's command, was put to death, August 23, 408. This tragedy encouraged the foes of the Church to hope for better terms from Honorius's new adviser: "The Emperor," they said, "was not really of Stilicho's mind; in regard to those penal laws

to which he consented he was made a tool of—now he will be himself.” Donatist outrages were renewed: another Council made fresh appeals to Honorius, and Olympius deemed it expedient to secure the Church’s good will by a series of laws renewing all former severities, insomuch that Augustine even remonstrated against a policy which seemed to him extreme: “We wish to have our enemies corrected, not to have them slain”—observe that the hostility here referred to is not mere sectarian opposition to the Church, but downright attacks on its buildings and its clergy—“when you sit to try cases of injury done to the Church, cases in which she has actually been a sufferer, pray forget that you have power to inflict death, but do not forget this my petition.” Yet, as we have seen, he rejected, as an opposite extreme, the principle that physical or legal force was not to be used in behalf of true religion, the principle of absolute toleration, which he himself had once held; he had persuaded himself that a certain amount of coercive and penal action was a legitimate, and often a salutary, method of leading men out of religious errors—in short, he had made out a theory of Persecution, differing only in degree from those which were so relentlessly carried out in after years, by princes who had learned that in the cause of the Church or of orthodoxy they were bound to exert the whole stretch of their secular power even in its most terror-striking forms.

Another letter, written by Augustine early in 409, was an appeal to the Donatists, upbraiding them with some recent Circumcellionist outrages, and reminding them again that, as the bestowal of grace through sacraments was a divine act, it could not be vitiated by the personal faults or sins of the human instrument in the administration. He also wrote very kindly and courteously to Macrobius, who had succeeded Proculeianus at Hippo, requesting him not to rebaptize a subdeacon called Rusticianus, who had joined the sect after being excommunicated for immorality by one of Augustine’s presbyters. “Let us acknowledge, brother, the peace of Christ, and hold it conjointly, and together study to be good, as far as God enables us, together amend those who are bad, without breaking unity, and with such discipline as we *can* exert; and for the rest, endure them with what patience we can muster, for unity’s own sake.” We know not what came of this touching appeal.

But there was now approaching, and well-nigh at the doors, an event which, to all subjects of the empire, must have been

appalling beyond every other catastrophe that its wonderful history had recorded. Stilicho's death had incensed and alarmed the barbaric auxiliaries who had been attached to his service. They looked hopefully to Alaric, who, after some vain attempts to come to an understanding with Honorius, invaded Italy, replying to a hermit's remonstrances with the assertion that "something within was irresistibly urging him to go onwards and devastate Rome." The Eternal City thus saw herself blockaded in September, 408. Famine set in; Læta, the widow of Gratian, spent large sums for the relief of the sufferers, but pestilence grew out of scarcity; envoys went forth to Alaric, tried him first with proposals which he laughed at, asked him what the hard terms which he himself exacted would leave them, and received the grim answer, "Your lives!" Then, in an unparalleled terror and despair, the pagan party, still existing and still strong in the senate, proclaimed that now at last was the time to resort to the ancient and long neglected gods. It would be remembered that, only seventeen years before, the rites even of Isis and Cybele had been performed under Eugenius; and by way of appeasing a dangerous agitation, the Christian prefect of the city proposed that Etruscan diviners should be allowed to go through certain mystic ceremonies which, they promised, would have power to direct lightnings against the foe. The wild hope was caught at; it is even said that Innocent himself, when applied to, gave a sort of permission for the *secret* employment of these "enchanters." But this limitation was scouted by the pagans; yet they found themselves unable, in presence of Christian opinion, to exhibit the weird ceremonies in public. Accordingly fresh negotiations were opened, in a humbler tone than at first; and the siege was raised for a large ransom of gold, silver, scarlet cloth, and pepper (perhaps spices). But when Jovius, Honorius's new minister, who had superseded Olympius, had begun to parley with Alaric at Ariminum, he found his master unexpectedly stiff; nothing would induce the pompous "incapable" to give Alaric the military command which had been held by Stilicho. Yet another and more moderate proposal was made by Alaric. But Jovius had now turned right round, and had induced Honorius to swear that he would never make peace with Alaric. Negotiations were broken off; and thus began a second siege of Rome in 409. The city was starved into surrender, renounced allegiance to Honorius, and accepted as Alaric's nominee a new Emperor, Ionian by birth, a convert from paganism to Arianism.

This was Attalus, whom Hodgkin labels "the Æsthetic," and who replied to overtures from the ever-shifting imperial court by a threat to banish Honorius to an island; to which Jovius, who had gone over to his side, added a brutal threat of mutilation. But the "anti-Emperor's" elevation turned his head: he talked big of what he would do against Constantinople; he neglected Alaric's counsel to send a sufficient force to Africa, and was compelled by him to surrender the purple of sovereignty, and lived to be humbled, mutilated, and banished by the Emperor whom he had professed to supersede. Yet another chance was now given to Honorius; but when, under the influence of Sarus, he again proved impracticable, or even defiant, Alaric struck his final blow. The Christian historian Orosius puts the result into three emphatic verbs—"obsidet, turbat, irrumpit."

The Eternal City was taken on August 24, 410, the Goths entering through the Salarian gate, on the east side of the Pincian hill. Then followed a sack of three days; but the mighty Visigoth "All-ruler" was no savage like Radagaisus before him, or Attila after him: he has been likened to a knight-errant, even to a Plantagenet; he ordered that life should, as far as possible, be spared, and that the two great basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul should be inviolable as places of refuge. The latter building had been expanded, under Valentinian II., from its original small dimensions into a majestic church, reproduced in our time by its noble modern successor. Thus, on the Vatican across the Tiber, and on the Ostian road to the south, the graves of the two Apostles were to be respected as sanctuaries: if one asks why the cathedral church itself, "in the Lateran," was passed over, the answer must be that it did not contain the tomb of a high saint. One scene is pathetically striking: Marcella, Jerome's friend, now an elderly lady, and long the centre of a pious female circle, had to see her palace on the Aventine invaded and was brutally beaten by Goths in quest of plunder, who at last relented and escorted her, with her adopted daughter Principia (another of Jerome's lady-correspondents), to St. Paul's basilica. The precincts provided Marcella with a death-bed: "after some days," says Jerome, "she sank to rest in the arms of Principia." A soldier demanding money from a religious woman in an ecclesiastical house at a distance from St. Peter's was led by her to a rich store of plate, which, she told him, "belonged to the Apostle Peter; she could not guard it; but if he touched it, he must take the consequences." He referred the point

to Alaric, by whose order the vessels were "borne, high overhead," in the midst of a vast train, and with hymns in which Goths and Romans joined, across the whole city to St. Peter's; whither, Orosius tells us, multitudes rushed to see "the vessels of Peter and of Christ." That there was, withal, a fearful amount of rapine and even of slaughter, must be taken as certain; but Augustine, in the opening of his "*City of God*," insists that there would have been far more but for the respect shown to Christian sanctuaries, within whose precincts, during those terrible three days, many a pagan found shelter who afterwards "imputed to Christ" the abasement and agony of Rome.

That abasement, that agony, were indeed regarded by many Christians with other feelings beside those of sympathy and grief. The fall of Rome from her immemorial pre-eminence, her exposure to barbaric insolence and violence, the irretrievable damage to much of her outward majesty, and to still more of her power to impress and fascinate,—these things constituted a whole so stupendous as to absorb, at first, every other sensation in awe at what Orosius calls "the ineffable judgments of God." It was a calamity unique, a crash unparalleled: the city which had been mistress of the world was to be taken twice again in this fifth century and once in the sixth; but none of these captures could match in dread significance the catastrophe of 410. If history could forget, in connexion with Rome, the names of Gaiseric, Ricimer, and Totila, she must needs remember Alaric.

It is touching to see how a pagan Gallic poet, who had held high office at Rome, insists on minimising her fall. It cannot be, exclaims Rutilius, that a city predestined to an eternal dominion can have real cause to "fear the distaff of fate;" it is traditional with her amid adversities to hope for better fortune; she must, and she will, ere long assume new force to countervail a temporary overthrow, and force the Goths to "bow their faithless necks." But Christian minds could not fail to dwell on the fact that she had long been the stronghold of a residuary paganism, that in the periodical persecutions the Babylon of the Seven Hills had often been drunk with the blood of the saints; and now she who had "sat as a queen," enriched with "merchandise of gold and silver, and precious stones and pearls, and purple and fine linen, and horses and chariots and slaves, and lives of men," had learned what it was to be made desolate. And so the first shock of amazement might be succeeded by a stern exultation that the Apocalyptic

vision had been verified in her fall; yet Christian hearts would not long remain untouched by pity for the universal suffering which had resulted, and which called forth active sympathy alike from the austere recluse of Bethlehem and the generous prelate of Hippo. Augustine tells us that his friend Paulinus, the devotee of St. Felix and the adorer and builder of churches, who had recently become bishop of Nola, prayed when the Goths took his city that he "might not be tortured on account of silver and gold." The fate of high-born Christian ladies, from Galla Placidia the Emperor's sister (who had fallen into Gothic hands, and who was afterwards to espouse Alaric's successor Ataulph) downwards, would be sure to attract compassionate interest; Rufinus was driven to end his days in Sicily; the mass of misery and impoverishment would task Augustine's power of showing how good might emerge from out of evil, and of meeting the pagan inference from the miseries of an empire that had forsaken its traditional or ancestral rites. And when thoughtful men looked into the future, they could see little but cloud and storm. What were those things that were now coming on the earth? It was, in the prophet's language, "reeling to and fro, broken down and clean dissolved." How much could be saved from the coming wreck? What would be the effect of such a shock on the already unstable structure of Roman civilisation and Roman social life? How would the Church hold her own before these wild and heretical invaders, who might well seem to be destroyers unable to reconstruct? In short, Christians would feel that it was a veritable "Day of the Lord,"—that in a signal crisis old things were passing away. But then, if it was *His* day in truth, they might be assured by their faith in "a Kingdom which could not be removed," that in any new order of European life which this epoch-making triumph might inaugurate, that "City of God" would prove itself to "have the foundations," which, as Augustine expresses it, "had brought all classes of human minds into subjection to itself," and bore in its bosom the principle of man's beatitude in the merciful activities of the grace of "God-made-Man."

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE DECLINE OF DONATISM.

WHAT, we may ask, was the general prospect of Christendom, as seen from the landmark afforded by the taking of Rome?

If we look at the East, we see that the feeble and indolent Arcadius had been succeeded by Theodosius II., a boy who had now entered his tenth year, and had sat on the Eastern throne since the 1st of May, 408. He had been placed under the care of the prætorian prefect Anthemius, whom Socrates calls the most sagacious of men, and to whom Chrysostom had written in 405 that, instead of being adorned by his high dignities, he adorned them by his character.

And the Church of Constantinople—what was now its state? Three years had all but expired since the death of its rightful bishop, at that wayside church in Pontus, had left the “Joannites” without even an absent head. They persevered, however, in disowning the smooth-tongued and (except towards themselves) not unkindly intruder who sat in Chrysostom’s place but by no means inherited his power of speaking to souls. Atticus delivered his commonplace sermons in St. Sophia, and doubtless saw the court-circles, and many of the most influential citizens, attending his ministry and supporting his authority. But the “Joannites,” although their circumstances might diminish their numbers, worshipped in the open air, as they had ever done since Chrysostom’s exile. The Novatians were troubled by the dissension between their main body and a little set of fanatics who, under the guidance of a converted Jew named Sabbatius, revived Quartodecimanism. The aged Arian bishop Dorotheus had been succeeded, in the year of Chrysostom’s death, by Barba, under whom, as Socrates remarks with astonishment, that heresy was supported by George, a first-rate scholar, and Timothy, a learned Origenist and

Hebraist, by whose influence the Arianism of Constantinople was gradually softened and improved. There was also living at Constantinople a bishop named Theodosius, who, according to Socrates, had been swayed by a coarse greed of gain in his attacks on the Macedonian sect in his diocese of Synnada: he had put arms into the hands of his own clergy, and denounced the heretics in the civil courts, in order, it is said, to extort money from them; and then, by a strange turn of fortune, while absent at Constantinople in order to ask for yet stronger measures against their bishop Agapetus, had been supplanted in his own Church by Agapetus, who dexterously chose that time for professing the Nicene faith and succeeded in keeping Theodosius out of the bishopric on his return. Theodosius, returning to Constantinople, and entreating the aid of Atticus, found cold comfort at his hands. The archbishop, seeing the advantage which the Church had gained by the adhesion of Agapetus, gravely advised Theodosius "to embrace a quiet life and to prefer the public interest to his own."

At Alexandria, Theophilus was drawing near his end. In 410 he had held the chair of St. Mark for a quarter of a century. The bitterness and vehemence which he had shown in the Origenist controversy and the attack on Chrysostom had probably worn themselves out. Several years had passed since, in his pamphlet or book against Chrysostom, written after his return from the Council of the Oak, he had described "John," late bishop of Constantinople, as ambitious, tyrannous, a "foe of humanity" (*i.e.* a man of inhuman spirit), a blasphemous against Christ; not only not a Christian, but more wicked than Belshazzar, although, like Satan, transformed into an angel of light. After Chrysostom's death he wrote to Atticus, urging a mild policy towards the Joannites, which should promote their reconciliation. And it was, perhaps, in the early part of 410 that he conferred the episcopal dignity on a remarkable man who had known Chrysostom during a three years' residence at Constantinople, and was, moreover, to say the least, but little qualified in the eyes of strict Churchmen, by some of his antecedents, for the work of a chief pastor. Synesius, the high-born Cyrenian who had been a deputy to the court of Arcadius; Synesius, the intellectual "son" of the female Neo-Platonist Hypatia; Synesius, the lover of philosophic repose; Synesius, the ardent sportsman, and (according to Evagrius) the unbaptized catechumen, the husband and father who was bent on family life;—what amazement must have seized the clerical mind of

Egypt when it appeared that *he* was demanded, by the people of Ptolemais, for their metropolitan see! He was known to be a man of powerful character. During his residence at Constantinople he had warned Arcadius that tyranny was the near neighbour of kingship, but that a thoughtful prince would keep them apart; that the theatrical display and elaborate observances of the imperial court had been found injurious to the empire; and that a prince who shut himself up in his palace with a troop of smooth-tongued flatterers might be said to live the life of a sea-plant. After his return to Cyrene he had personally taken part in defending the city against Libyan brigands, and “wearied himself in stationing night-sentries.” He had worked his way out of Neo-Platonism into a more or less Platonic Christianity, which, however, as expressed in his hymns, recognises not only the Unity in Trinity, but also the Divinity of the Virgin-born Jesus. Such were his antecedents when the episcopate was proposed for him. To do him justice, he himself was astounded, and wrote to his brother as to the difficulty in which he was placed. “I am, you know, very fond of amusement, whenever I relax my attention to books. A bishop must lead a very serious life, must be immersed in ecclesiastical business, must be apt as a teacher of religion, and have his heart set on the things of God. Now, I have a wife from whom I will not live separate; . . . and I hold opinions, derived from philosophy, not easy to reconcile with some prevalent religious notions: for instance, I shall never believe the soul to be originated later than the body, nor admit that the world is destined to perish; and the received doctrine as to resurrection I take in a mystical sense, not in the popular one. I am willing to keep my opinions to myself, for the common people cannot have the full truth presented to them, any more than weak eyes can bear the sunlight” (observe here the extent to which his habits as a Platonist student had led him to carry the principle of “economy”): “falsehood” (or perhaps we should render it “fiction”) “is necessary for them: and in public teaching I could conform to necessity, I could repeat the current stories; but I never will deny or disclaim my real sentiments; and Father Theophilus must know them, and decide. Then as to hunting,—well, it *will* be hard to see my darling dogs unemployed, and my bows worm-eaten; but I will bear this sacrifice bravely, if God requires it.” This was the singular confession of his mind, at so unlooked-for a crisis, which the philosopher of Ptolemais made to his closest confidant. It is

not altogether surprising that his objections were overruled. "His great abilities would be so useful to the Church, his enlistment in her service would be a brilliant stroke; as for his conjugal habits, they might be condoned;" as for his esoteric opinions, Theophilus, the persecutor of the Tall Brothers on suspicion of Origenism, was content to interpret them indulgently, and to hope that, once a bishop, he would glide into full orthodoxy alike of teaching and of belief. But to allow a man, as bishop or as priest, to repeat formulas in public, without publicly explaining the sense in which he took them, was hardly a "veracious" proceeding, and was akin to the "philosophic" and non-Christian notion of an intellectual aristocracy which alone had a right to the full "truth." However, the wishes of the Cyrenians were respected: Synesius, most unwillingly on his part (he says he should have preferred death if he could have felt free in the matter), was consecrated, after first receiving baptism. He took some time in schooling himself to his new life; but neither secular habits nor liberal speculations made him shrink from the full use of hierarchical authority. He became a guardian of orthodoxy, comforted a bishop who had been expelled by Arians, and warned his own presbyters against Eunomian intruders patronised by one Quintianus; and also told them that any who on the pretext of helping the Church filled his own purse would be better outside the Christian pale. Holding himself bound, as he told Theophilus, to "treat as a law whatever the throne of Alexandria might ordain," he endeavoured to carry out the archbishop's plan of erecting the two towns of Palæbisca and Hydrax into a bishopric, or rather of restoring the bishopric irregularly erected there in the days of St. Athanasius. Ultimately the intense reluctance of the people to be severed from the episcopal charge of Paul, bishop of Erythrum—a reluctance shown by wild outcries of protest—induced him to refer the matter back to Theophilus, whom he also consulted as to the treatment of bishops who had roamed away from their sees. In another and far more striking case which occurred soon after his consecration, the new metropolitan made Church power felt, with salutary results, by a criminal whom some bishops would have scarcely dared to attack—Andronicus, the tyrannous governor of Berenice. Of this man's conduct one sample suffices: when Synesius, after several admonitions, tried to rescue from his grasp a nobleman whom he had put to the torture under the burning noonday sun, he said thrice to the trembling sufferer, "'Tis vain for you to trust

in the Church: were you to embrace the feet of Christ Himself, no one should deliver you from Andronicus's hands." Forthwith assembling his clergy, Synesius pronounced the sentence of excommunication. "Be every temple of God shut against Andronicus and his followers! Let no one, official or private person, sit at table with them, converse with them, attend them to the grave! If any one, bishop, priest, or deacon, shall despise this Church as a small one, and receive those whom she has condemned, he has divided that Church which by Christ's intention should be One! With any such, who choose to have part with Andronicus and Thoas, we will not join hands or eat, least of all communicate." For a while, on Andronicus's professed penitence, the sentence was suspended; but he outdid his former offence, and the excommunication was accordingly put in force. It will be admitted that the power of retaining sin was never exercised in a case more simply moral; and Synesius had an opportunity, somewhat later, of showing his Christianity by helping Andronicus, when in his turn he became a sufferer from injustice and needed the charitable compassion of the Church. This happened before the autumn of 412, when Theophilus died, refusing to the last to insert Chrysostom's name on the diptychs as a bishop who had died in the Church's fellowship, and declaring that "Father Arsenius" was indeed "happy in having always kept the hour of death before his eyes."

Arsenius himself, soon after the fall of Rome, had his own troubles, beside that grief over the state of the empire which drew continual tears from his eyes; for the "barbarians" drove the monks of Scetis from their retreats, and Arsenius compared this disaster to the loss of Rome. These raids of fierce marauders were a frequent terror at this time. Thus we hear of the perils undergone in the Sinai district by Nilus, an ascetic who had bravely rebuked Arcadius for banishing "the pillar of the Church," and whose son narrowly escaped being sacrificed by the Saracens to the morning star. Jerome had some experience of them in Palestine; Chrysostom had hardly been safe from them within the stronghold of Arabissus; in many a quiet monastic settlement the rumour of their approach would be as terrible as the sight of the Northmen's barks to the brethren of Iona or Lindisfarne, in those wild after-days when every holy house was more or less exposed to the chances of rapine and bloodshed.

At Antioch, the intrusive bishop Porphyrius was still in

possession; so that three of the four chief sees of Christendom—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch—were separated from Rome and the West on the question whether Chrysostom's memory should be honoured by reciting his name among departed bishops at the Holy Eucharist. Among the bishops of Asia Minor who recited that name with most special cordiality and reverence was one destined to promote a heretical movement which Chrysostom would have abhorred, Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Looking eastward, we observe the important mission of Maruthas, bishop of Tagrit, or "Martyropolis," in Mesopotamia, once found among Chrysostom's enemies, to the Persian king, Isdegerdes I. His detection of an imposture by which the Magians tried to frighten the king into dismissing him contributed to his success; he was allowed to erect churches where he would. This mission of Maruthas—whether its purpose were, or were not, to induce the Persian king, out of regard for the Eastern Emperor, to spare his Christian subjects—is supposed to belong to 410 or 414.

Let us return to the West. In Dacia, the mission work of bishop Nicetas, of Romatiana, not far from Sardica—a prelate whose training and devotion are celebrated by Paulinus—had produced very happy results. "Christ," said the poet, after some intercourse with Nicetas, "will, by thy feet and lips, visit the Scythians, the Getæ, the Dacians." The trouble caused by the heterodoxy and deposition of Bonosus was not yet fully over; Nicetas had taken part in that difficult business, but questions still arose as to the position of clerics whom he had ordained before his condemnation, and who had refused to forsake him afterwards.

In Gaul the main subject of interest would be the recent sufferings and martyrdoms caused by German invasions, against which not even the Pyrenees proved an effective barrier. Just one year before the taking of Rome, and two years after the successful usurpation by a fortunate soldier, chosen apparently because of his name of Constantine, of the sovereignty of Gaul and Britain, an irruption of Suevi and Vandals into the Spanish peninsula suddenly plunged it into all the horrors of slaughter, famine, pestilence, and gave to the neighbouring provinces beyond the Pillars of Hercules a dismal forewarning of what they in their turn might suffer. For them, however, the dark day was not yet: they were to "have rest" twenty years, and were to

furnish the area for movements of vast importance to the whole Church, to the whole cause of Christianity. And thus we are again brought round to Africa.

A few weeks before the taking of Rome, and during the period of toleration which all dissidents had enjoyed in consequence of the Emperor's political necessities, the African Council had sent four deputies to the court, the result of whose mission is perhaps to be seen in the revocation by Honorius of all freedom of worship recently granted to "enemies of the holy law." This edict of August 25, 410, was followed by a letter dated October 14, in which Marcellinus, "tribune and notary"—*i.e.* one of the highest class of the bearers of imperial commands—was ordered to carry out the project of the Catholic bishops of Africa (a project discussed, as we have seen, for some years before this, from the Council of 403 onwards) by summoning the Donatist bishops to attend a gathering, in which both parties, by representatives, should fully discuss the question between them. The meeting was to be assembled within four months after the publication of the rescript in Africa; the place, of course, was to be Carthage. If the Donatists, after three summonses, failed to send their delegates, they were to be treated as contumacious, and their people were to conform to the Church, "acknowledging their teachers to have been overcome by default, and regarding themselves as bound to obey in this, if not imperial orders, at least the true sovereignty of the Catholic law." Marcellinus was to act as judge, and to take care that all imperial ordinances as to that "law" (the term "law" being here used, as often by emperors, for religion) were fully and strictly carried out. He was to refer the results of the conference, or the sentence passed on "the contumacious," to the Emperor, that the latter might speedily learn how far his mandate had availed "to confirm the Catholic faith."

That the conference thus provided for could possibly end otherwise than by the victory of Catholic argument, or, as this rescript puts it, by the triumph of "plain reason" over "superstition," was never imagined by Honorius or his advisers. The Donatists evidently thought that their case, under such a weight of imperial disfavour, would not be fairly heard on its merits; for Augustine tells us that they received the tidings with "Woe to us, Union is coming!" They probably imagined that Marcellinus, a thorough Churchman, held by Augustine in high regard and esteem, would be unable to act with impartiality. But the tribune did all in

his power to quiet such apprehensions by the edict which he published about the end of February, 411, in which he declared that each side was to state its case fully, and even engaged that all Donatist bishops who promised to attend should be at once put in possession of the churches they had formerly occupied, "in order that, the *status quo ante* being renewed, the discussion might begin on fair terms." If distrust of him threatened to cause any delay, he would consent to have a colleague selected by the Donatists; but, in either situation he promised, "by the wondrous mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, by the Emperor's salvation, and by the awful day of judgment," that he would decide strictly according to evidence, and that the Donatist deputies should have freedom to come and return unmolested and in safety. He concluded by assuring the Donatists that any "concussion" or illegal violence, done to any of them by the messengers bearing the citations, should be visited with fitting punishment. It is evident that neither Roman nor Christian fairness could do more.

Augustine went to Carthage for the conference about the beginning of May; and, during the ember fast which followed the festival of Pentecost, addressed the Church-people (in a sermon reckoned as his 357th) on the blessedness of the peacemakers, and urged them to treat the sectarians on their arrival with due gentleness. "Don't say, 'I cannot stand So-and-so, because he insults the Church or because he slanders my bishop.' You will oblige your bishop if you refrain from all words that would aggravate the quarrel. You would like, you say, to tell the man your mind? Well, I don't say, 'Be silent,' but, 'Speak—not to him, but to God *for* him.'"

The four months actually expired on Friday in Whitsun-week, May 19; but Marcellinus appears to have granted a further delay, under powers received from the Emperor, until June 1. However, on May 16, about 270 Donatist bishops entered Carthage in stately procession, so as to attract the gaze of every one in the city: the Catholic bishops, 286 in number (these numbers show how thick-set Africa was with bishoprics), arrived with less display. The tribune then published a second edict, emphasizing the importance of the inquiry and describing the arrangements proposed. Each party was to choose seven disputants, provided with seven assistants or advisers. No others were to be present; there should be no public or general gathering to constitute a popular auditory: the place was to be the Gargilian Baths. The minutes were to be taken down by official clerks, and by four

secretaries of each party, who were to be superintended in their work by four bishops in rotation on each side; the minutes were ultimately to be signed by the disputants before publication; after each day's conference a day was to be allowed for making up the minutes; the prelates on both sides were to signify, in letters signed by their chiefs, that they agreed to the provisions of this order. The Donatists, on May 25, drew up a declaration or certificate, signifying their obedience to the summons, but objecting to the part of it which limited the number of the disputants, on the grounds that it was inconsistent with the former edict and was calculated to encourage a notion fostered, they said, by their opponents, that they themselves were few in number; they also commissioned Primianus, their bishop at Carthage, and six others, to uphold the cause of the Church against the "Traditors." The Catholics replied to this by requesting that, if the Donatists were allowed to attend in full numbers, they themselves might attend in numbers to be approved by Marcellinus: they also, in formal meeting, drew up their own act of delegation, naming seven representative disputants, among whom were Aurelius, Alypius, and Augustine, with seven others as advisers, and four others to superintend the minutes. The Catholic bishops further sent a second memorial to Marcellinus, which appears as the 128th of Augustine's letters, though the two prelates specially named in it are Aurelius of Carthage and Silvanus primate of Numidia. This document contains what is best worth remembering of all the proceedings of the conference—the noble proposal that, if the Donatists were confuted and induced to join the Church, the Catholic and Donatist bishops should occupy the episcopal throne by turns (a singular arrangement which was said to have prevailed in Africa in regard to episcopal converts from schism), or, if the faithful disliked such a combination, then both should resign and a new election take place. Then follow the glorious words which so well illustrate the Apostle's precept in Phil. ii. 3-5: "Why should we hesitate to offer to our Redeemer the sacrifice of such a humiliation? Did He descend from heaven into a human body to make us members of Himself, and shall we be afraid to descend from our chairs to spare His members a cruel laceration? Enough for us surely to be faithful and dutiful Christians: as for the episcopate, it was for the sake of the Christian people that we received it; let us deal with it as may best promote their unity. If we are His servants, let us not grudge Him eternal gain for the sake of a

temporary exaltation. The episcopal dignity will be more profitable to us if, by laying it down, we can gather together His sheep, than if, by retaining it, we disperse them."

At last, on June 1, 411, the conference opened in a spacious and airy "secretarium" or public hall attached to the baths above mentioned, in the very centre of Carthage, near the base of the great hill Byrsa or Bozrah. The Donatists were allowed to appear *en masse*; the Catholics were represented by their eighteen delegates. By way of a beginning, the edicts and other important documents were read, and hours were spent in verifying the signatures to the acts of delegation. Then all but the delegates of either part withdrew; it was already 5 p.m., and both sides were glad of an adjournment. A day intervened, as had been arranged: on June 3 the second meeting opened with a curious exhibition of Donatist temper. "We can't sit down, because the Divine law" (alluding evidently to Ps. i. 1 or Ps. xxvi. 5) "does not allow us to sit along with such adversaries as these." Thereupon the Catholics stood up: even Marcellinus, who was officially described as the Cognitor or judge, had the good taste to send his own seat away, and endured, as best he might, the wearisome pettifogging cavils of the sectarian delegates, who insisted that the minutes had been falsified. To disprove this imputation, the tablets of the clerks, with a roll of parchment on which the minutes had been partly inscribed, were produced in a linen cloth, secured by a Catholic and a Donatist seal. Again the day was wasted over these devices of obstruction; and the adjournment, this time, was until the 8th, when something like real business began, the question arising as to whether Catholics or Donatists were plaintiffs. The Donatists tried to throw the "onus" on their opponents; and after the imperial rescript had been read, as the warrant of Marcellinus's action, Augustine avowed that the conference had been asked for by the Catholics, in order that the Donatists might either prove, or be found to have failed to prove, their charges—"I do not say against us, but against the whole Christian world," his favourite and sometimes misconstrued argument from the *orbis terrarum*. Marcellinus, not without humour, referred to the words of the rescript, and said, "Your holinesses will now be pleased to show clearly on which side lies 'the superstition,' as opposed to 'the plain reason,' therein mentioned." The Donatists asked that the Catholics' petition for the conference, and their commission to their deputies to the court,

should be read. "Why so?" it was asked in rejoinder; "what could be thus added to what we already acknowledge?" Marcellinus ruled in the same sense, and declared that the reasons for the request, whatever they were, were irrelevant to the present inquiry; and met a Donatist objection to the name "Catholic" being conceded to their opponents, by pointing to the Emperor's own language: it was enough for him to use it as his master had done, but, as he afterwards said, "without prejudice; after the conference, the party adjudged to be victorious will possess the title." "*We have the right to it,*" said Augustine, "for we are in union with the whole Church." "No," said the Donatist Gaudentius, "it is we who have that Church which has sacraments without defect or flaw." "Do you," asked the Donatists again, "appear as plaintiffs or as respondents?" "A fair question," said Marcellinus. "We are here," said Augustine, "to meet their charges against the Church." "That is a fair reply." "Ask them," said a Donatist, "whether they bring any charges against us." "Well," said Augustine, "they call us sons of Traditors." Marcellinus here observed that it appeared on the Catholic showing that both parties had asked for the conference. Petilianus urged him to rule authoritatively whether his friends had a right to ask for the reading of their opponents' petition to the Emperor; but Marcellinus curtly answered, "*Jam pronuntiari,*" and a document was cited as showing that the Donatists had asked for a hearing as early as 406.

This started a discussion about the earlier documents of the case. "If *they* are to be brought up," said Augustine, "we must ask to hear the original appeal of the first Donatists to Constantine." "No," said the Donatists, "we do not stand on processes of that sort: it is to the Divine law, to Scripture, that we appeal: if you also appeal to it, put human documents aside." "Well, but," said Augustine, "there are two distinct questions: one of principle, to be settled by Scripture proof—Which is the true Church? and another of fact, to be settled by documentary evidence—Was So-and-so a Traditor?" Marcellinus agreed that the two distinct questions of principle and of fact must be settled by distinct kinds of evidence; and so the reading of documents, as germane to the second question, proceeded, with frequent interruptions which exhibited the Donatists' ability in special pleading. "Here," they said, "is a memorial which proves that, as far back as eight years ago, those men took up the line of plaintiffs or accusers;"

and "here," said their opponents, "is one very much earlier, the report of Anulinus to Constantine, proving that it was *their* predecessors who accused Cæcilian." After this see-saw process it is refreshing to get a hold of the real issue. The Donatists object to Augustine's contention that, even if such charges *were* true, the offences of individuals would not prejudice the Church. "Tell us plainly," they said, "do you admit, or do you not, that your case is compromised by Cæcilian's personal conduct? You say that, *if* he was guilty, he was like the chaff on the threshing-floor or the bad fish in the net, and that the Church is not to be abandoned because of bad members. In one word, is he your father?" "Not my father, for he belonged to the Church, as I do; we name him at the altar, we commemorate him as a brother: but we have one Head, and that is Christ."

The Donatists, by way of arguing the question of principle, presented a memorandum which they had drawn up as a reply to statements in the Catholics' act of delegation. In it they repeated their familiar topics. The Church, even in this world, should be without spot or blemish; the field with tares in it is expressly said to be "the world" (Matt. xiii. 38), and the world is not the Church; the bad fish in the net (an ingenious gloss this) were such as could not be detected; the guest without the wedding-garment was cast out. It was a simple scriptural obligation to "depart from the tents of obstinate men," to avoid contact with "the unclean thing;" and so the apostles ejected Simon, Philetus, Hermogenes (rather, Hymenæus). As for baptism outside the true Church, martyrs (meaning Cyprian) had pronounced it to be null, and therefore converts ought to be rebaptized, that is, baptized *de novo*—observe here that the "plenary council," as Augustine calls it, of Arles had been held after the schism had begun, and that the Donatists would not acknowledge its decision in favour of the validity of all baptisms administered with the right "form." The document went on to charge Catholics with persecuting Donatists for more than a century; to disown the analogy between their proceedings and the attitude of Primianists towards Maximianists; to recite a list of Catholic "persecutors," including Paul and Macarius who had been sent in 347 to enforce conformity. Augustine replied to the statement of principle. The parable of the Tares required the sense which Catholics put upon it; the body of the story implies that the tares grew up within the religious area, so that the "world" must here be taken

to mean the Church as world-wide, which must contain evil mingled with good. "Are we," he asked, "to desert the Church because of this condition of human infirmity? Our way of separation from bad members must be by avoiding their vices. I admit that there must be discipline, even excommunication, for the welfare of souls, and that it will be effectual, to a certain extent, for the Church's purification; and there will be a time of absolute Church purity—but in the next world. The Church is 'one,' we acknowledge; our contention does not divide it into two: all we say is, it has two states, or exists in two conditions—one here, the other hereafter."

Again the pendulum sways back to the historical question: the barbarities of the Circumcellions, especially instances of lime and vinegar poured into the eyes, were depicted; the case of Donatists slain at Bagai was discussed, and it was shown that some of them, in the wild fury of such fanatics, had actually slain themselves; the acts of the Roman Council in 313, by which Cæcilian was acquitted, were adduced on one side, on the other those of the Council which condemned him in Africa, with a letter of bishop Mensurius to Secundus, which, as it turned out, did not prove Mensurius to have been a Traditor. To show that some of Cæcilian's enemies were themselves said to be Traditors—to have surrendered, for instance, a church-lamp, a box, and casks containing vinegar—a Council was quoted as having met at Cirta soon after the great persecution; and the Donatists' attempt to disprove its historic reality, on such grounds as that its acts mentioned the day and the consulate, was baffled. When the Maximianist schism was mentioned as an indication of the schismatical spirit ingrained in Donatism, a Donatist was so incautious as to adopt the Churchman's proposition, "One man's faults do not compromise another." In regard to the Roman Council, the Donatists tried by very flimsy expedients to involve Pope Miltiades in the guilt of being a Traditor. Constantine's own declaration, after the inquiry at Milan in 316, that Cæcilian had been found innocent, was subjected by the Donatists to the arbitrary scepticism which always discredits a cause, and which here drew from Marcellinus the formal pronouncement that imperial letters, whether dated or not, were above question before a tribunal. Then came a debate over a passage in Optatus, to the effect that "advice was given that Cæcilian should be detained at Brescia for the sake of peace;" but

the context showed that he had been judicially "pronounced innocent." At this a laugh arose, which must have become louder when the Donatists exclaimed, "We did not ask to have *that* read!" But they had lost their heads, and floundered helplessly, raising points self-evidently futile or quoting documents which told decisively against them; as, for instance, the first Donatists' letter to Constantine about "*his* scoundrel of a bishop," or his letter recalling them from exile with bitter expressions of disgust. "All wondered," says Augustine, "with what eyes they could have read the very papers which they adduced, or with what voices they could recite them." Their own evidence declared Felix, as well as Cæcilian, to have been formally declared innocent—Felix's guilt, it should be remembered, having been found to rest on a forgery added to a genuine letter.

Here the debate essentially closed. After one or two pitiable attempts on the part of the Donatists to evade the force of these records, and again to traverse ground that had been exhausted, Marcellinus asked if they had any real counter-evidence. There was none; so the Catholics called on him "at last to finish the case." He assented, and bade both parties withdraw, that he might put his decision into form. He had all along been acting primarily as an imperial commissioner for the decision of questions of fact. Yet the purely theological question as to the relation of ministerial conduct to sacramental efficacy had necessarily come in: the Catholics had put it forward as distinct from the other; and Marcellinus did indirectly, as it were, pronounce that, even if Cæcilian had sinned, his guilt could not involve the Church. But he went no nearer to the proper province of an ecclesiastical tribunal; he decided on the broad ground of the proved falsity of the charges against Cæcilian and Felix, referring, like a Roman magistrate, to the recorded judgment of a proconsul and to the sentence of Constantine "of triumphal memory." The truth, he declared, had been brought to light, and falsehood, as now detected, must bow before it. Therefore, he proceeded, all magistrates, landowners, tenants, are hereby ordered to prohibit Donatists from meeting in cities or other places; the churches which Donatists have been allowed temporarily to hold are to be given up, without delay, to the Catholics; to attend Donatist meetings will be to incur punishment at the Emperor's will; forbearance has been carried to its limits and will go no further. Every Donatist bishop will go home in perfect safety: if he will join the Church,

he knows the good terms which will be offered him by her bishops ; if not, he must expect to feel the penalties of the law. Finally, all who know of Circumcellions meeting on their lands must expect such lands to be confiscated, unless they endeavour to repress a "frenzy" which offends alike against religion and public order.

Such was the sentence of Marcellinus, published on the 26th of June, 411. That the Donatists should complain of his conduct was a matter of course, and Augustine therefore exposed theirs (in contrast to that of the upright magistrate) in a treatise "To the Donatists," written in the year after the conference ; and further, observing that no one cared to wade through the lengthy minutes of the conference, he took great pains in abridging them for general readers in the form of his extant *Breviculus Collationis*. Marcellinus having reported the decision to Honorius, and the Donatists having appealed against it, the Emperor promulgated a final and highly penal law against them at Ravenna, on the 30th of January, 412. By this ordinance, all relaxations of previous penal laws were cancelled ; and it was enacted that unless the Donatists should, by a stated day, have returned to Catholic unity, they should be mulcted according to a graduated scale of fines, including all classes from the "Illustres" to the Circumcellions—a proof that the sect numbered among its adherents some persons of the highest civil or military rank. It was made penal for any persons in the imperial employment to screen any Donatist from official cognisance. A special fine was to be levied on the wives of schismatics ; slaves belonging to the sect were to be recalled from their "bad religion" by the admonition of their masters, and rustic husbandmen by "reiterated beatings." Donatist clergy were to be sent out of Africa into various places of exile ; and all churches or estates belonging to the "heretics" were to be made over to the Catholic body.

These stringent methods of procuring "unity" were successful in breaking down the resolution of all but the most determined of the Donatists. Augustine tells us that some of them declared that they would never unite with the Catholics, even if the untenableness of their positions were demonstrated ; but this assertion is probably founded on misapprehension or false report. It is certain, however, that the Circumcellions broke out with fresh fury, as they had done seven years before, on the publication of the Edict of Union. At Hippo they slew a Catholic priest named

Restitutus; they seized another, named Innocent, beat out one of his eyes and cut off one of his fingers. The perpetrators of these deeds were arrested and brought before Marcellinus: he forced a confession from them, but, as we are expressly told, employed no tortures properly so called, such as fire, iron hooks, or the "Little Horse"—that hideous rack which figured so often in scenes of Christian martyrdom—but only that lighter infliction of the scourge, which, says Augustine, is used by "teachers of liberal arts, by parents, and often by bishops themselves in the administration of justice." But Augustine's compassionate heart was roused to plead against any extreme sentence in the case of these criminals after a confession thus obtained. He wrote to Marcellinus, entreating, "by the mercy of Christ," that neither death nor mutilation might be inflicted; that the suffering of God's servants might not be avenged, as if by a law of retaliation, in the blood of those who had been proved guilty; "that they might only be restrained from their frantic restlessness and set to some useful occupation." He also wrote to the proconsul Apringius in the same sense—observing that, even if he were addressing a heathen magistrate, he should not so "abandon the Church's cause" as not to plead against a bloody vengeance, which might "tarnish" the honour of her confessors; but that he might say to him, as a son in Christ, a son of the Church, "Remember our common cause; bring out in full light that gentleness which belongs to your mother; treat these wretched offenders with a forbearance which may contrast with their own ferocity; and save us from the pain of finding, at the end of the official report of these proceedings, the record of a bloody punishment." We see here a singular confusion in his mind between "vengeance" and judicial punishment. Once more again, a little later, Augustine wrote to Marcellinus, mentioning the audacity of a Donatist bishop named Macrobius, who had "gone, among other places, to Carthage, opened the basilicas on his own estate, and assembled congregations," having with him one Donatus, a rebaptized ex-Catholic, who had been foremost in the outrages. For the third time he entreated that the lives of the Donatist ruffians might not be taken by the operation of the law. If the proconsul, though lenient by nature, should press for extreme punishment, he begged that his letter might be read, and that in the last resort an appeal might be made to the Emperor for mitigation of the death-penalty. Such lenity, he was aware, would seem to some Churchmen "mere

negligence and weakness ;” but when angry feelings had cooled down, it would be seen in its true light. It is remarkable that Augustine was at this very time engaged on a long letter to Marcellinus, intended to answer some difficulties proposed by a thoughtful inquirer named Volusianus ; one of them being no other than the often-debated question whether the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount did not make civil government impracticable—to which Augustine answers, “Those precepts as to turning the other cheek and not resisting evil, relate rather to the inward disposition of the heart than to the outward conduct ;” adding that severities to criminals may be the truest mercy, and that a just war *may* be waged in conformity with Christian benevolence.

It is but too probable that Marcellinus’s decision against the Donatists cost him his life. A sudden revolt of Heraclian, “Count” of Africa, was speedily crushed, and a certain count Marinus was sent to do execution on his accomplices. He is supposed to have been induced by Donatists to include Marcellinus—against all probability—in the number ; and in spite of an order from Honorius for his release, the good and equitable tribune was put to death in the September of 413, thanking God “that the punishment of his sin was not deferred to the next life.” Augustine’s grief may be imagined : Honorius, for once, showed his displeasure vigorously by recalling and displacing Marinus ; and in a law of the next year confirmed the decision pronounced by Marcellinus “of honourable memory.”

It was somewhat later than the correspondence with Marcellinus, that Augustine, who, during these months, appears to have had his hands full of literary work, wrote a letter to the Donatist laity in the name of a Council of Bishops held at Circa under the Numidian primate Silvanus. This letter, dated June 14, 412, was designed (like the *Ad Donatistas post Collationem*) to meet the slanderous rumour that Marcellinus had been bribed to decide against the Donatists—“the only plea,” as he says, “which beaten men are wont to urge.” It gave a full narrative of the conference from Augustine’s point of view. Its exhortations to conformity were apparently productive of the return of a large body of Donatists at Circa to the fellowship of the Church. We have a letter addressed by Augustine to them, and another to two presbyters and other clerics, converted, as he expresses it, to Christ’s peace and unity. He exhorts these converts loyally and cheerfully to discharge their ecclesiastical duties according to

their degrees, to fulfil their ministry with fidelity for the sake of that God under whom he was their fellow-servant, and to abound in tenderness, as they would have judgment shown them in mercy. "Pray also with us," he continues, "for those who are still out of temper, that the infirmity of the carnal mind in them may be healed, after having been contracted by such long habit. The God to whom we pray for them is powerful and merciful to bring even them, by any occasions that seem best, to salvation. May the Lord preserve you in peace!"

With these noble and touching words we may close this narrative of Augustine's efforts against the Donatists' obstinacy. The law of 412, says Fleury, was the "death-blow of the schism." And yet, under whatever discouragement and repression, it appears that the traditions and the passions of Donatism were sedulously perpetuated; the fire of sectarianism was never, through long years, allowed to become extinct; it is startling to find that, after nearly two centuries had elapsed, the revival of Donatist activity engaged the solicitude and kindled the apprehension and indignation of Pope Gregory the Great. He exhorts African bishops to be up and doing against audacious schismatics who have disturbed Catholic peace, bribed some Churchmen into accepting rebaptism, driven away some bishops, and, if he is rightly informed, actually persuaded one prelate to acquiesce in the erection of a Donatist episcopate within his own city; and he complains to the Emperor Maurice that the anti-Donatist penal laws have been allowed to sleep, to the "ruin" of souls and the humiliation of Catholicity, so that it is high time for the intervention of the civil power.

Such was the strangely tenacious life of what appears to us the most unattractive and indeed repulsive of all sects that in early times kept their hold on doctrinal orthodoxy; such the protracted mischief that came of some personal piques and injurious rumours, acting on honest but ignorant zeal, a dogged national character, a hard self-righteous fanaticism. We gladly bid farewell to one of the unsightliest phenomena in Church history; but we must not forget the lessons which its career is calculated to teach, and which are written in large characters for the warning of religious parties throughout all time. Enthusiasm, however earnest or even passionate, for a magnificent moral ideal, is not of itself a guarantee of being in the right track. The vision of a perfectly spotless Church may entrance many souls which feel that purity in the largest sense is the supreme good, and persuade

themselves that it would be possible, by strenuous efforts against worldliness and inconsistency of conduct, to realise that supreme good in a whole Christian community—nay, more, that it is strictly a duty to establish this result. They may assume that to aim at what is so excellent is itself a proof that they are serving Christ without compromise. And they may clean forget to ask whether Scripture does really encourage such a programme; whether the ideal, applied to existing conditions, may not mislead; and whether it is not, after all, more truly loyal to recognise the limitations which a mysterious Providence has set to all human enterprises, even to such as wear the holiest aspect. When such considerations are overlooked, balance is disturbed, the sense of proportion is perverted, “extreme” or even fanatical views of duty commend themselves as a matter of course; and a zeal which is not according to knowledge takes possession of the whole man, and presently exhibits itself as a zeal without justice, without truthfulness, without charity, without the healthful self-mistrust which excludes spiritual pride and sustains the consciousness of personal frailty and sin. Then it becomes natural to ignore facts, to repeat unverified statements as to other men’s conduct, to commit oneself to doctrinal propositions which break down when tested by the root-principle of the Gospel; then, as the controversy waxes hot and the determination to succeed *quocumque modo* hardens, it seems necessary to accept the help of agencies not only coarse and rough, but brutal and criminal; and so a movement which began by assuming that the Church could attain to heavenly perfection in this world is impelled by partisan rancour into courses which characterize it as “earthly, unspiritual,” and something worse.

“*Thou to wax fierce in the cause of the Lord,
To threat and to pierce with the heavenly sword?*”

The brief stern poem by Newman which opens with these lines, conveys, as Dean Church has said, “a warning which ought never to be out of our remembrance.”

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE RISE OF PELAGIANISM.

“WHILE the heresy of the Donatists was falling, there was rising up another, still more dangerous—that of the Pelagians.” In these words Fleury introduces his readers to that great controversy, so full of inexhaustible and most vital interest, which for the first time fixed the thought of Christendom on the subjective side, as we may express it, of theology, or, as others would probably prefer to say, on the “anthropology” of Christian religion, on questions directly connected with the conditions and capacities of the soul, rather than with the nature or the actings of God. And here several points are worthy of notice. For (1) we must surely recognise the fitness of that providential sequence whereby the Church was led to contemplate and study the fundamental doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Redeemer’s Godhead, before she was plunged into a discussion of mankind’s relation to that Redeemer’s Person and work. This is the significance of the fact that the Arian controversy preceded the Pelagian. (2) Another point of interest is that which Guizot brought out with such force and clearness, that the Pelagian controversy dealt with a problem which *must* be great and urgent, independently of all theological discussions within the specially Christian area, the problem of the existence in man of a free will which is at once real and stringently limited. (3) Nor can it escape our observation that Pelagian thought evidently tended to reintroduce a pagan element into Christian theology; as Arianism had injured the Christian idea of God, so this new upgrowth of rationalistic speculation materially affected the Christian idea of redemption, and, while retaining the Christian phraseology on that subject, associated it with what was virtually Naturalism. (4) To modern Christians, again, the controversy should be interesting, because modern religious thought, by way of reaction from Calvinism, tends to

treat Christianity simply as a means of moral elevation, and Christ as a type of moral excellence proposed for imitation; while the idea of a real communication of spiritual life from Him as Head to Christians as members is put aside as a bit of unverifiable mysticism, and at the same time the sense of sin, and of spiritual need and spiritual capacity, is impaired. (5) It is also one of the sad lessons which this chapter in the history of heresy brings before us, that unchristian theories have often been originated by men of pure life and of serious integrity of purpose toward religious belief and conduct; while another warning to theologians is involved in those one-sided over-statements of the truth attacked into which Augustine's zeal betrayed him with manifold and deplorable results.

And yet those who in our day approach the study of this controversy may as well be warned that certain influences afloat in the religious atmosphere are apt to prejudice an inquirer against the side which won in the contest. Augustine was, as we all know, the great champion against Pelagius; and "Augustinianism" has of late become something like a byword. It is held to represent an exaggeration of the "ecclesiastical" idea; and this disparaging estimate will naturally give a lift in people's minds to the cause which he strenuously opposed, as if it were, in effect, the cause of freedom, while the formulas connected with "grace" and "original sin" become associated with such terms as dogmatism, technicalism, sacerdotalism, and the like. And yet again, even apart from such rigoristic peculiarities, the idea of a divine "immanence" in nature as a whole, and pre-eminently in human nature, makes persons averse to "supernaturalism," as if it introduced into thought a dualism offensive to all scientific premisses, and, from a religious standpoint, as if it interrupted the unity of the divine operation, and represented the Creator as obliged to mend His own work, to provide for the cure of evils that might have been excluded from the first. As men are tempted to explain away the uniqueness of the Incarnation, so they are apt to minimise the significance of such terms as restoration, or redemption, or mediation; to smooth away all antitheses between what is called nature and what is called grace, until the latter becomes only a refinement of the former; in short, to attenuate the New Testament teaching as to the evil that calls for a vast remedy, and as to the office and work of Him who came to apply it.

For ourselves, as Englishmen, it is matter of some interest that Pelagius, though not of our race, was a native of our island, which had long been the home of a weak but orthodox Church. He was a British monk: so Augustine, who knew him personally, repeatedly calls him. Orosius describes him as a layman and intimates that he was of too humble origin to have had a liberal education; but if this was the case, he must have neutralised the effect of early disadvantages by very diligent and successful study, since we read that, before he appeared as a heretic, he composed three books on the Trinity, which were "calculated to be of great use to students." That he was anxious to promote active piety is clear from his having composed a book of extracts from Scripture, modelled on one of St. Cyprian's writings. Augustine, writing in the year 417, testifies that "Pelagius, while staying at Rome, was held in great honour," and was "loved by Paulinus of Nola as a servant of God," and says for himself, "I not only did love him, but I do love him, though now with a desire that he may be delivered from sentiments adverse to the grace of God." We find Chrysostom, in the last year of his life, as Montfaucon reckons, referring to a monk named Pelagius, who had "led a strict and ascetic life," but had afterwards been "drawn away," apparently into the ranks of Chrysostom's enemies; and when Tillemont wrote, it was generally supposed that this was the heresiarch. But chronological reasons oppose this identification, for Pelagius certainly had come to Rome in the episcopate of Anastasius (398-402), and then "spent a very long time" there. He could hardly, therefore, have been mixed up in the Eastern party-strife which ensued on Chrysostom's expulsion.

The question whence Pelagius derived the notions which he worked up into his heresy is answered in the Commonitory of Marius Mercator, afterwards the lay representative of Western orthodoxy in the Nestorian controversy: "The opinion, contrary to the Catholic faith, affirming that Adam and Eve were created mortal, and that their transgression did not injure their posterity, was long ago expressed among some Syrians, and mainly in Cilicia by Theodore, sometime bishop of the town of Mamsuistia," or rather Mopsuestia. To name Theodore in connexion with Pelagianism is to touch a link between that heresy and Nestorianism. For Theodore was, in fact, the father of Nestorianism, and was honoured for centuries by its adherents as "The Expositor;" and it is very interesting to consider how the

two theories were combined and interdependent in a mind like his, signally acute, consistent, and logical. His drift and trend will be best explained in connexion with the Nestorian controversy; but we may say here that Theodore regarded our Lord not as Himself, in literal truth, the Word incarnate, but as the one man, the one human person, in whom that Word could dwell with full approval, and by whom, accordingly, He acted as through an instrument more perfect and effective than any other human agent of His will. This was in effect to substitute a specially close association for an Incarnation properly so called. And with this Christology was united an anthropology to match. Human nature, according to Theodore, was created mortal, and it was derogatory to the divine justice to say that Adam's posterity incurred death because of his sin. To the question, What was Theodore's starting-point? Which of his two theories led to the other? the answer might be propounded that perhaps an imperfect estimate of man's moral need, of the disease to be remedied, suggested an equally imperfect estimate of the Person and work of man's Restorer, so that "the Nestorian Christ" became "the fitting Saviour of the Pelagian man;" and so Professor Swete considers that Theodore started with a defective view of sin, and then came to think that a human saint might be an adequate Christ by supplying mankind with a signally impressive example. Or it might be that Theodore, as a vehement opponent of Apollinarianism, was first led to take up with a lower view of Christ as not in His own person a life-giving re-creator of humanity, and so passed on to a denial of the Fall and of the need of grace. In either case he persuaded himself that he was securing a due place for moral interests in reference to the value of Christ's example and to the probation of human character.

Mercator goes on to say that the theory called Pelagian was brought to Rome by Rufinus, a Syrian by origin, who cleverly kept his own name clear of obloquy, while imbuing Pelagius with this "impious absurdity." Who was this Rufinus, who links Pelagius with Theodore? It would be impossible to describe Rufinus of Aquileia as a Syrian; and when we find Coelestius, the associate of Pelagius, tracing his opinions to "the holy priest Rufinus who dwelt at Rome with the holy Pammachius," we see that such a description would by no means suit the famous Rufinus, who avoided Rome when Anastasius was Pope, and would never have lived with the friend and correspondent of

Jerome. Perhaps Rufinus the Syrian was that Rufinus whom Jerome (in controversy with Rufinus of Aquileia) speaks of as having been sent, with other friends of his, into the West to defend a person named Claudius before the Emperor. That Jerome reckons Rufinus of Aquileia among the precursors of Pelagius, is simply an instance of his identifying all who were not anti-Origenists, in his own sense, with the Pelagian party or its sympathizers.

It is more interesting to observe the manner in which the ideas communicated by Rufinus were united in the mind of Pelagius with genuine zeal for the interests of practical Christianity. His book of *Eulogiæ*, or extracts from Scripture (in Latin), which Augustine calls "*Capitula*" and "*Testimonia*," was intended to furnish helps in the daily strife with sin, and to quicken the sense of moral responsibility. For this end it was thick-set with brief terse propositions affirming the strength and freedom of the will, and ignoring, as was afterwards contended, the facts of its weakness and its need of restorative grace. A letter written by him to Paulinus, about 405, dwelt similarly on the "natural power" of the will, and was similarly criticized, in later days, for its reticence on "Christian grace." Further, we are told that certain hortatory letters to a widow, containing at least one passage which might well seem "Pharisaic" in its tone—"He uplifts his hands worthily to God who can say, 'Thou knowest, Lord, how holy and innocent are the hands which I spread forth to Thee,'"—were confidently attributed (though he disclaimed the authorship) to Pelagius; but even in them a fair judge would discern the eager desire to promote religious strictness. Lastly, we see this point most clearly in the well-known anecdote that, while Pelagius was living at Rome, a bishop one day quoted in his presence the prayer which Augustine had recorded in his Confessions: "Give what Thou commandest, and then command what Thou wilt." "Pelagius"—so Augustine wrote, more than twenty years afterwards—"could not bear to hear this; he contradicted it somewhat warmly, and nearly quarrelled with him who had mentioned it." We can understand his feeling, if we suppose that he was seriously alarmed as to the effect of such words on the very principle of moral exertion. "Give what Thou commandest!" he would say. "Is God to be expected to save us 'without our stir'? Are we to sit with folded hands, instead of striving, wrestling, taking the kingdom by force, labouring and energizing in the work of our

salvation? Surely Christians are too ready, as it is, to excuse their own idleness under the pretence of depending on God's working; to deceive themselves by talking of their weakness; to forget that they *can* serve Him if they will; to fancy that they honour Him by a listlessness which wears the mask of pious humility, but is in fact no better than undutiful and ungrateful sloth." Something of this sort, at any rate, was doubtless in his mind. It is most important to remember that, in this sense, he had "a zeal for God," although, being one-sided in its form, it was, emphatically, "not according to knowledge." As Apollinaris and Eutyches were "very jealous" for Christ's true Divinity; as Nestorius thought himself called upon to protest against any debasement of the idea of the Godhead; and, to come nearer the point, as Novatian intended to bar out laxity, and as the Donatists were enamoured of the vision of a spotless militant Church; so the ascetic British-born sojourner in the world's old capital was thoroughly possessed with the one idea that men's wills needed rousing into energy, that they must, by all possible means, be dragged out of their comfortable inaction, that they, half wilfully perhaps, underrated their own power of doing right, and were content with passively expecting to be wrought upon, moulded, and saved, by a "mercy" or "bounty" which should leave them nothing to do. Thus it was that he mistook the true sense of Augustine's "Give what Thou commandest." He caught at one side of the twofold truth, and practically nullified the other, because that one side was in his eyes all-important.

With this genuine moral earnestness, and this intellectual tendency to exaggeration, we can imagine Pelagius welcoming the thoughts which Rufinus, perhaps, had formulated, as containing the lesson which the times needed. He knew not, as he brooded over them, that he was "halving," and therefore corrupting and maiming, the Divine morality of the gospel, and that a leaven of unchristian pride within his own soul was making him revolt against the mystery and the humiliation involved in the full doctrine of man's fall and of God's redeeming grace; that he was effectively raising up an "imagination" against the true "knowledge of God," and undervaluing his obligations to the Restorer and the Sanctifier. We may summarise the theory which he began, as early as 405, to shape, and cautiously and gradually to advocate, in two brief sentences—the first, and in some sense the more prominent, of these positions being logically grounded on the second: "We need

no special supernatural Grace, and that because we have no inborn disease of Sin." He began by thinking and speaking about the former point; but he at once proceeded to connect it with the latter. So it was that while, at Rome, Pelagius became conspicuous by his arguments about the moral sufficiency of natural freewill—arguments which Augustine characterizes as levelled against grace—he was also employed on a Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, in which he set forth many objections against the idea of transmitted or inherited sinfulness, but took care to do so in the character of an opponent or querist (one or more) rather than in his own person. This work, finished before the final siege of Rome, was addressed, says Marius Mercator, "to those on whose friendship the author could rely."

Pelagius had spent a long time at Rome when he was joined by a keen-witted associate, whose dialectical skill had been trained at the Roman bar. This was Cœlestius, whom some suppose to have been an Irishman, on the ground of certain expressions in Jerome, which others, more probably, apply to Pelagius: certainly that fiery controversialist would not have scrupled to vilipend Pelagius as very likely not even a British provincial but a native of the still more distant island distinguished from Britain by the title of "barbaric," and on that assumption to sneer at him as one who had been "fattened on Irishmen's porridge." Cœlestius, after his practice at the bar, had spent some time in a monastic cell, whence he wrote three letters to his parents, which Gennadius of Marseilles, the continuator of Jerome's series of brief biographies *De Viris Illustribus*, and himself an approximator to Pelagianism, describes as "useful for all who were seeking to know God" and as "exhorting to the practice of virtue." In him, therefore, as in Pelagius, there was probably this sincere but ill-directed zeal against indolent and self-excusing Christians; but in him, still more, apparently, than in Pelagius, there was a disposition to rationalise, to explain away, the distinctively evangelical doctrines of the Fall of Man and the New Creation, and to cast all religious questions into the mould of hard disputations logic. Some specimens of his writings, to be presently referred to, account for the language used by Augustine as to Cœlestius's subtle and acute intellect, and as to the "outspoken boldness" in which he surpassed his more cautious master; they also illustrate the expression of Marius Mercator in the first of his two Commonitories, "He imbibed in the most unqualified manner the impious theory of Pelagius,

and by his incredible loquacity made many persons partakers and accomplices of his own infatuation." And his dialectical turn, while it reminds one of Arius, illustrates a point which is curiously suggestive. The strength of Pelagianism, apart from its appeals to moral earnestness, lay in a sort of common sense logic, which, as mere logic, might seem intellectually satisfactory, but which proved utterly helpless when it had to deal with the mysteries of human nature in itself and in its relation to God. To those "tremendous paradoxes" (to adopt the language of a vivid writer) which the unhappy and the conscience-stricken can understand, the Pelagian has no key; he simply "stares at them and passes by," as if they did not exist.

The two friends left Rome in the year before it was taken by Alaric, that is, in 409. They proceeded first to Sicily, where, as we infer from a letter written some years afterwards to Augustine, they deposited, so to speak, some germs of thought which contained the essence of Pelagianism—an excessive estimate of man's moral capacity, and a denial of "original sin." They then crossed over to Africa: Pelagius paid a short visit to Hippo, and thence betook himself to Carthage. Whereas at Hippo he had been very reticent as to his opinions, at Carthage he seems to have persuaded several persons to think and say that "infants were baptized, not for remission of sin, but in order to be sanctified in Christ." Some such talk reached Augustine's ears, and once or twice he himself met Pelagius. But he was absorbed at that time in the business of the Donatist Conference of 411: although what he heard was a startling novelty, yet he had no good opportunity for attacking it; the speakers were persons of no weight; the matter slipped easily out of his mind. Towards the end of that year Pelagius departed for Palestine; Coelestius remained at Carthage and endeavoured to obtain admission to the priesthood. "But," says Augustine, "by the faithful boldness of the brethren, he was brought before the bishop as judge, on account of these very disputations against the grace of Christ." Paulinus, the deacon and biographer of St. Ambrose, presented a formal indictment, or "libellus," to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, accusing Coelestius of having not only asserted in his own person, but disseminated by his agents through various provinces, the following errors. Marius Mercator copied them from the records of this Carthaginian inquiry, which were before him when he wrote; and by combining the accounts in his two Commonitories, and comparing them with

Augustine's account in his treatise *De Gestis Pelagii*, we obtain the seven propositions imputed to Cœlestius :

1. Adam was created mortal : whether he had sinned or not, he would have died.

2. Adam's sin harmed himself only, not the human race.

3. Infants, when born, are in that state in which Adam was before his transgression.

4. As all mankind did not die through Adam's death or transgression, neither do they rise again through the Resurrection of Christ.

5. The Law "sends men to the Kingdom of Heaven," just as the Gospel does.

6. Even before our Lord came, there were men who lived without sin. To which apparently was added by way of corollary—

Men can live without sin and easily keep God's commandments, *if they choose.*

7. Infants, even if unbaptized, have life eternal.

In the Council or Court of Inquiry, before which these charges against Cœlestius were laid, Augustine was not present. But Aurelius did his part well, with dignity and perspicacity ; he caused each article to be read separately, and asked Cœlestius what he had to say to it. On the second article Cœlestius said, "I have certainly expressed doubts as to the transmission of sin, but I have not dogmatically denied it. I have said that I would agree with any one to whom God had granted the grace of knowledge ; for I have heard different opinions on the subject from men who held the rank of presbyters in the Catholic Church." Thereupon Paulinus—who probably remembered some emphatic language of St. Ambrose on the effect of Adam's sin on his posterity—desired Cœlestius to name the persons referred to ; and Cœlestius answered, as the minutes report, "The holy presbyter Rufinus, who abode at Rome with the holy Pammachius—I have heard *him* say that there is no transmission of sin." "Any one else ?" "Yes, I have heard others also say the same." "Tell us their names," rejoined Paulinus. "Is not one priest enough for you ?" asked Cœlestius. The bishop of Carthage ordered other articles to be read ; and then, referring to the third article as to the negation of inherited sinfulness in infants, asked Cœlestius whether he had ever taught what the deacon Paulinus imputed to him. "Let him explain," said Cœlestius, "what he means by 'before Adam's transgression.'" "Do you rather deny, if you

can," said Paulinus, "that you *have* taught this. Either disclaim it or condemn it—one of two things." Again Cœlestius demanded further explanation; again Paulinus proposed his alternative. Aurelius interposed: "You mean, brother Paulinus—do you not?—that Adam, in paradise, was at first immortal, and then, by disobeying the commandment, became mortal?" "Yes, my lord." "Well, then, what the deacon Paulinus wishes to know is, whether, in Cœlestius's opinion, infants before baptism, at the present day, are in the same state as Adam before his transgression, or derive the guilt of transgression from that sin-stained origin from which they are born." Cœlestius repeated that he had heard "many Catholics deny the transmission of sin, and others assert it. Let it be a matter for discussion, not a matter of heresy. I have always said that infants need baptism, and ought to be baptized: what more does he want?" He presented, says Augustine, a "libellus" or memorial, in which he amplified this statement by saying that infants needed baptism in order to be "redeemed;" but he would go no further. He would not admit any transmitted taint; he would not condemn the various propositions imputed to him; and after several sittings the Council pronounced him excommunicate. Marius Mercator tells us that he at first "thought of appealing from this sentence to the judgment of the bishop of Rome," who possessed an acknowledged yet indefinite primacy; "but he soon laid aside this plan of appeal, betook himself to Ephesus, and there had the assurance" to renew his application for the priesthood. The Council of Carthage appears to have drawn up seven propositions in negation of those attributed to Cœlestius, and Augustine and other bishops did their best to warn their people against theories which they unhesitatingly set down as novelties destructive of true belief in the Redemption. In a sermon preached about this time, Augustine insists that to say that infancy has "nothing for Jesus to save is to deny that Christ is Jesus to Christian infants;" and that such a denial is incompatible with the sound rule of faith. In another, he declares that of all the mass of human beings derived from Adam, there is not one who is not sick, and none is healed save by Christ's grace; that if infants brought to baptism are affirmed to have no inherited guilt, the Church ought to answer, "Take these innocents hence;" and that the doctrine now called into question was part of the Church's inviolable heritage, received from the faith of the Fathers, and to be held fast persistently to the end.

But Augustine was now called upon for the first time to engage in direct polemics against what we may henceforward call Pelagianism. The decree of Aurelius had not silenced all discussion. Every day Augustine's friend and correspondent, the tribune Marcellinus, then still alive at Carthage, was wearied by endless talk about the *rationale* of infant baptism; and he wrote to Augustine for a sound statement of the case. Here we may pause for a moment to observe that the practice of infant baptism was not indeed invariably adopted—for, as in Augustine's own case, parents often thought it best to defer a child's christening until later in life, and, in spite of the exhortations of great Fathers, too many persons would still think it safest to defer baptismal responsibilities until the approach of death—yet was regarded as a Church usage lifted above criticism or gainsaying. Churchmen, therefore, assuming its legitimacy, would naturally wish to have it brought under the shelter of a principle. As we have just seen, Coelestius gave his own account of its reasonableness: he did not explain it merely as an admission to external Church fellowship, nor as the "pledge" or guarantee of future divine blessing; still less, if possible, did he refer to any "hypothetical" construction of the language which accompanied it. He admitted that infants brought to baptism did then and there receive a benefit, and actual interest in Christian "redemption." Thus the question presented itself for answer; and hence the appeal of Marcellinus, which produced Augustine's treatise in three books, "On the Deserts of Sins and their Remission," written in the latter part of the year 412.

In this, his earliest anti-Pelagian work, Augustine contended that since baptism, whenever administered, was professedly administered "for remission of sin," such administration must take place in the baptism of infants, for to suppose an unreality in this respect would be "execrable and detestable." Turning to the interpretation of Scripture, he maintained that St. Paul's text, "Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin," could not fairly be interpreted with reference to the mere imitation of Adam's transgression by his posterity, but must imply some real relation between the nature derived from Adam and a state of condemnation affecting all who inherit it, independently of, antecedently to, any personal sin on their part, even as justification consists not merely in a "following of Christ," but acceptance of and union with Him as the Source of a purified humanity. Augustine puts aside as futile the distinction drawn between

being baptized for remission of sin and being baptized for salvation, and insists that infant baptism must have for its doctrinal basis the existence of what he described as *originale peccatum*, or "sin" attaching to every one from birth—our Lord's human soul of course excepted. The second book is devoted to the denial of actual sinlessness in any human soul but that of our Lord. In the third—which has the form of a letter—Augustine criticises statements in Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul, and declares that he does not know of any orthodox writer who had ever denied "original sin."

Now, here we encounter an infelicitous phrase, which could not but involve the debate in ambiguities, and which gave to his opponents an occasion for even sharper antagonism than would in any case have accompanied the controversy. For "peccatum" suggests sin in the ordinary sense, an act of personal revolt against God's will, for which we are responsible as for any other act of our own; whereas what is with us "originale," or contracted at our very birth, is a condition of moral disorder, a taint, a warp, a twist, affecting our inner nature and constituting what might be described as a principle of sin—in Pauline phrase, a "law of sin;" a corruption innate, the material out of which actual sin will develop, a propensity or bias towards evil, "a baseness in the blood at strange war with something good"—called theologically "concupiscence"—which perverts the will-power from the outset.

That such a bias does exist in human nature is a fact which, as Mozley has said, is not only acknowledged but proclaimed even by "worldly philosophers and poets," and the modern doctrine of heredity (under whatever limitations) accentuates our dependence on antecedents manifold and even remote—though if it thus abates the difficulty attaching to "inherited sinfulness," it needs to be balanced by a recognition of those corrective forces which go far to cut off the entail of evil. Here, then, is a verdict of universal experience, attesting what various writers have described as a "worldwide disfigurement of human life," a "fault or vice" in mankind as such, a "fatal taint" running through the mass, a "power which makes for unrighteousness in the life shared by the race," and which shows its baneful presence in even the earliest movements of childish self-will. In the awful words of Newman, "the human race is involved in some terrible aboriginal calamity; it is out of joint with the purposes of its Creator; and thus the doctrine of what

is theologically called original sin becomes almost as certain as that the world exists, and as the existence of God." Now, if religion professes to interpret man, it must have something to say on so tragical a matter. No doubt, its accredited mouthpieces may go wrong at this or that point of their interpretation. They may forget Pascal's remark that the transmission of sin from the first parent took place under conditions differing from our own, and is beyond the reach "of our present capacity;" they may be over-confident in their inferences from scriptural language, may exaggerate the taint into a "total corruption," or overstate the connexion between it and the first "transgression," as if that primal sin were literally imputed to all the descendants of the transgressor,—whereas, without going to these lengths, there is only too much solidarity for evil attaching to the race as a whole. But some account, however provisional and tentative, they must offer; some comment they must make on the "stupendous and distressing fact," as seen in the light of Christian redemption.

Another letter from Marcellinus produced the most beautiful and the most characteristic of all Augustine's writings on the doctrine of Evangelical Grace—the book "On the Spirit and the Letter." He insisted in this work on the absolute necessity of excluding all evasive and inadequate senses of grace, and of recognising it as a presence of the Holy Spirit within the soul, bestowed not in view of any pre-existing goodness in the man, but for the purpose of creating true holiness and thereby securing the fulfilment of the "claim" of the moral law. This leads him to give his matured view of the great text, 2 Cor. iii. 6, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." The "letter" was not, as he had once thought, the literal or immediate purport of Scripture. It was the moral law simply as law, a series of prohibitory mandates, standing as it were outside the man, commanding and threatening, imposing on the mind a new consciousness of what was sinful, but not awakening in the heart any sympathy with the divine will: the result would be to irritate the corrupt human will to an even passionate resistance, as a stream is fretted by a mass of rock in its course—the simile is Augustine's—and so to produce moral "death." And the "Spirit" meant the presence of the Inspirer of holy desires, entering into the soul, appealing to the affections, calling forth love in answer to love, enabling the will to unite itself cordially with the will of a recognised Father, and

thereby "writing His law on the heart," and making the whole man "live" unto Him and in Him. This is one of the most satisfying pieces of exegesis which we owe to Augustine: he is never more truly at his best than when he thus exhibits the specialty of the Gospel as bringing the divine Love and the divine Strength into intimate union with the soul of the believer, awakening gratitude and trust, and thus enlisting the affections on the side of an obedience which will not be grudged submission but whole-hearted loyalty. The principle is of far-reaching application: any rule of observance or of conduct, however good it may be, however venerable in its sanctions, will be but a "letter that killeth," so long as it is followed from "obedience without love," as a debt to be paid, a task to be got through. It is only when we associate it with the Infinite Goodwill, and find in it a new opportunity of filial responsiveness, that it becomes in its degree a manifestation of the working of "the Spirit that giveth life."

With the "De Spiritu et Littera" must be combined a long letter to Honoratus "On the Grace of the New Testament," touching in part on the doctrine of Christian justification, as constituted in the possession of the divine gift called grace, and as originating the whole series of those "good works which God hath prepared that we should walk in them." And here it may be observed that Augustine's unfamiliarity with Greek (caused possibly, in part, by his old dislike of Homer lessons) led him wrong, to some extent, on two not unimportant particulars. He mistook the force of $\epsilon\phi' \alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ in Rom. v. 12, misrendered *in quo* in the Latin version, by understanding it to mean literally "in Adam" in the sense of an imputation of Adam's sin to "all," whereas it means "inasmuch as;" and he assumed that to "justify" meant to make or render righteous, whereas this is but a derivative sense, secondary to its proper Pauline meaning of restoring to divine favour or placing in a state of acceptance. Yet that strangely involved context does insist on a causal relation between sin and death, does imply in verse 14 that the sin which brought death on the multitudes who had "no law"—who could not incur death, as did Adam, by breaking a known commandment—must in some sense have been that of the first parent, and does expressly affirm this in verses 15 and 17: and of the twelfth verse an excellent commentator has said that "the words 'through one man' affect the whole of it." A bare theory of "imputation," either of Adam's sin or of Christ's merits, would create a serious moral difficulty. We must suppose,

in the former case, the presence of a taint or corruption, "pervading" the whole race as death pervades it; and in the latter, a moral condition on the part of the person "justified," a genuine if only inchoate self-surrender, a faith which already, to some extent, operates through love.

The extraordinary versatility and activity of Augustine's mind are illustrated by the fact that, while he was thus grappling with a new theological controversy varied in aspects and far-reaching in issues, he was beginning the most famous, perhaps, and the most elaborate of all his treatises, which afterwards attracted the admiration and interest of Charles the Great, who used to have it read to him at dinner-time. The work "*On the City of God*" was designed in the first instance as a reply to the stock argument of paganism, familiar, as Tertullian tells, to pagan life amid the troubles of the second century, "It is Christianity that has brought these miseries on the empire: they are a punishment for desertion of the rites which had made Rome great." Marcellinus had heard that sullen growl of the still powerful heathen remnant, and urged Augustine to take the point in hand. But the work grew and grew as Augustine thought and wrote: he poured into it vast stores of erudition as to pagan religion and philosophy; he attacked the pleas which connected paganism with public prosperity or with the soul's welfare after death; and only in the eleventh book did he come to the main theme, the contrast between the City of God, the spiritual Christian society, and the City of this World, in their progress and their character. It may indeed be thought that he failed in two respects: first in his attempt to prove that Christianity had *not* been prejudicial to the Roman State as such, whereas a religion that was "jealous" of all rivals, that refused to stand side by side with the worship of the Capitoline Jupiter, that rebuked pagan laxities by its own uncompromising standard of conduct, could not but act as an irresistible solvent on the huge State-structure that had so long been held together by polytheism and Cæsar-worship; and next, through imperfect recognition of that fact which St. Paul had emphasized, and which ecclesiastical zeal has only too often ignored—namely, the sacredness of the civil order, of the State, as, in a true sense, "God's minister," and as not to be associated with "the world" in the sense in which Christians have to renounce the world.

The treatise was commenced in the early summer of 413, shortly before the execution of Marcellinus, who had been accused, as we

have already seen, of complicity in the revolt of Heraclian, the "Count" of Africa. Anxiety while there seemed to be hope for his friend's life, and grief when his fate was sealed, might well be supposed to have absorbed all the feelings in Augustine's mind at this critical period; but he was never more active in a literary sense. He had written a book "*On Faith and Works*," by way of confuting a strange form of Solifidianism, which asserted that a believer, even if he led a bad life, would be "saved so as by fire;" and on the 25th of June, by desire of bishop Aurelius, he had delivered a sermon at Carthage, unhappily characterized by what will strike a modern reader as indifference to the truth of the divine equity, in its relentless application of Rom. v. 18 to the case of unbaptized infants, whose condemnation, he had already said, was inevitable, though it would be "of the gentlest kind." To Augustine, we must confess, the moral difficulties which we feel as clinging to his uncompromising logic on these topics were hardly intelligible; he took a short way with them by his favourite quotation "O the depth!", the very context of which might have taught him better (Rom. xi. 32, 33). On the subject of inherited sinfulness, of a defilement needing to be cleansed, he read out a striking passage from the 64th letter of Cyprian—a doctrinal authority which in that place would be held to admit of no appeal—to the effect that an infant on coming into the world contracts "the contagion of the ancient death of Adam, and needs baptism for the remission of sins which are another's and not his own." Towards the end of the sermon he adopts unusually forbearing language towards the followers of Cœlestius: he will not call them heretics, but rather brethren who have got out of their depth; but he insists that the question is really fundamental, that the doctrine assailed is "established by the full authority of the Church," and that erroneous teachers, if, after full time has been allowed them, they persist, must needs be put under censure.

Another expression of his convictions was drawn forth by a Sicilian named Hilarius, who consulted him on some points raised by Pelagius in Sicily. Could any man live absolutely without sin? According to Scripture, Augustine answers (in a letter reckoned as the 157th of the series of his letters), no man ever did or does; but the contrary opinion is not an intolerable error. What is far worse—indeed detestable—is to maintain that freewill can produce good acts without the aid of grace. Then as to the condition of infants: they cannot be saved, they must be lost,

without being united to Christ; and they cannot be in Christ, cannot be regenerate, except through baptism. He insists on the parallelism of the two Adams, and attributes the salvation of Old Testament worthies to their faith in the coming Messiah. On a perfectly different point he gives a balanced and moderate judgment. Was the mere possession of riches sinful? A notion to that effect might have seemed to the monk Pelagius the only adequate construction of certain Gospel texts; but Augustine affirms that it is possible for men to have the necessary spirit of self-renunciation without literally giving up all their property to the poor. Here observe that it is the advocates of a Christianized "naturalism" who are fanatically intolerant of anything short of complete and tangible surrender of riches, or even of property short of riches; and it is the Catholic doctor who says in effect, "Distinguo," who upholds the principle of a diversity of gifts and capacities, and insists on a recognition of the ordinary as well as of the extraordinary degrees of Christian attainment. Lastly, in reply to the question, "Is any kind of swearing lawful?" he lays it down that it is best not to swear at all—that to swear habitually is to risk lapsing into perjury—but that to swear truthfully is not a sin.

Yet again we find him appealed to, with more important results, by two young Pelagians, Timasius and James. The famous British monk had persuaded them to forsake the world for what was deemed the especial "service of God." They now sent to Augustine a work which, they said, was by Pelagius. Would he read it and answer it? They had begun—through the reading of some of his writings—to reconsider their position; and therefore they apply to him for further light. Augustine read the work, and his reply is a treatise "On Nature and Grace," in which he did not keep back the repellent side of his theory with regard to all who die without having heard of Christ, or its connection with strict predestinarianism; but the book must rank high among his anti-Pelagian writings for its historical bearing on the whole controversy: he took a long time over it, and the delay caused some disappointment. It contains many extracts from the work under consideration, which exhibited the argumentative "acuteness" of the author, his "plausibility" in argument—in short, "his great ability;" all this his critic fully recognises, commends his protest against an "untruthful humility," and acknowledges that he thinks he is pleading for God by "defending nature," and that he is

zealous against those who make their "weakness an excuse for sin." Augustine even illustrates this notion by quoting Sallust, "Men speak falsely when they complain of their own nature." And at first he thought that Pelagius was really coming round and admitting the necessity of grace. "This delighted me extremely; but as I read on, I began to suspect that by 'grace' he meant only natural power," that is, the power of free choice, freely bestowed on man at his creation. In that sense, as he says further on, Pelagius asserted "the grace of God," with a show of indignation at being supposed to ignore it. What he was thinking of appears, says Augustine, from the phrase which he repeatedly uses, "the Author of nature;" he means, in short, a natural moral power. But *that* was not grace, and to affirm it was not what was required. The question was, Did he admit an inherent moral disease, which needed a supernatural restorative force really imparted through Christ, in answer to Christian prayer, and in order to help men to avoid sin? On this point the treatise in question was "remarkably silent." There was no avowal of belief in any such transcendent operation, first originative or prevenient, then co-operative or sustaining; and to come short of this was (consciously or not) to "frustrate the grace of God," to "make the Cross of none effect," to sink the Saviour in the Instructor, to exaggerate man's possibility or capacity of avoiding sin, to imagine that nature was not so damaged and wounded, so marred and ruined, that its "sickness" was not so universal, as was in truth the case. At one point we come nearly, but not quite, in sight of a modern controversy: Augustine, in dealing with the question whether any human being save Christ had ever lived wholly without sin, admits, tentatively, another exception: "For the honour of our Lord, I do not choose to have any question raised as to the holy Virgin Mary when we are treating of sins;" but by "sins" he means here, not "original sin," but sins personal or actual, so that his words give no support to the theory of her "Immaculate Conception." On the whole, he inclines to think that no man ever attained to sinlessness; the question is not important, except in connection with the Pelagian theory that man not only could keep himself from all sin, but could do so by unassisted natural power. Augustine concludes his treatise by considering some passages (about the question of sinlessness) quoted by Pelagius from approved Church writers, as Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Jerome, and pronouncing them irrelevant, as were also, he added,

some words cited from an early work of his own on "Free Choice." Here we may notice his courtesy: "I ought not to be ungrateful for the honour he has done me." "But," he proceeds in effect, "the context will show that I was referring to, and presupposing, a capacity not natural but imparted through Christ."

Pelagius, as we have already seen, had been bred up in the monastic life; and we must now observe the line which he took in regard to a remarkable monastic self-dedication. Among the Roman ladies who had fled to Africa was Demetrias, a member of one of the noblest of Roman families, in which "the consulate seemed hereditary." Without prompting from her pious mother and grandmother, she resolved, after the example of St. Agnes, to embrace the life of a dedicated virgin. This act excited general admiration, and was hailed with joy by the African Church. Jerome, in his letter of congratulation, written in 414, went so far in hyperbole as to say that it might even "slake the smouldering ashes of Rome," and that the tidings had made Italy "lay aside her mourning vestments, as if the Gothic host had been destroyed by lightning." He descends, however, from these extravagant flights to give Demetrias advice as to Scripture study, regulated but not excessive fasting (as to which he says that he has known "overmuch abstinence to affect the brain"), avoidance of all dangerous society, whether male or female, judicious expenditure of wealth on the poor and on "God's servants,"—not, says the austere recluse, who had almost the feeling of a Puritan on that point, on building and decorating churches: "I do not blame such work, but I only say it is not for you." He prescribes six hours of prayer (midnight, morning, terce, sext, none, and evening), and desires her also to divide her day, and prevent it from seeming long, by a variety of employments, such as the womanly labours of the loom; he warns her against Origenistic speculations, and bids her cleave to the faith of Pope Innocent; he drops a hint on the peril of spiritual pride which, one must think, part of his own letter might have encouraged; he gives very sensible advice against too much solitude; he holds up as a warning, in another direction, the self-pleasing laxity of some virgins who brought discredit on their class. This was Jerome's counsel to Demetrias; but from Palestine came also a different letter, which her mother's importunity drew forth from the "British monk," who had lived in such repute at Rome. Pelagius began by insisting on the power of the will, but expressly

added that in a Christian it was "aided by the assistance of divine grace;" he was eloquent on the dignity and judicial authority of conscience as "presiding in the citadel of the soul," and deciding as to evil and good; he recited examples of Old Testament piety; he went fully into details of Christian duty as to the government of thought, desire, and feeling, as well as of act and word, distinguishing between thoughts which simply float before the mind and those which are welcomed by a sinful consent; he bade the daughter of "the illustrious Anician house" remember that true nobleness had its seat in the soul; he advised the same thoughtful and systematic study of Scripture to which Jerome himself had exhorted her, and reminded her that reading must be accompanied and fertilised by earnest and devout approaches to God. He satirised hypocritical ascetics who cast down their eyes, sighed repeatedly, called themselves miserable sinners, but at the first affront broke forth into fury. In another passage he censured the languid sloth of those who replied to the divine commands by complaining, "It is too hard—we can't do it; we are but human." On the whole, a religion of realities, not of professions, was set forth as the one thing needful. The writer enlarged with solemn emphasis on the need of great labour for an eternal prize, on the urgency and awfulness of preparing for the judgment.

Was there, it might be asked, any heresy in this letter? The need of an "aiding grace" was more than once acknowledged; and if in one passage Pelagius told Demetrias that "no one beside herself, no one external to herself, could bestow on her those riches that were spiritual"—words which Augustine criticized in a letter to her mother Juliana—the expression might well be harmonized with that need. But one who believed in the necessity of real inwardly-working grace would undoubtedly, on reading Pelagius's language, have said that such divine assistance, transcending both natural capacities and opportunities of moral instruction, and appealing directly to the will with the offer to help, was *not* recognised; and that, interpret as one might, it could not be called a satisfactory or evangelical statement of the case, if for no other reason than this, that it exaggerated the moral resources of human nature, and did not assign to a present and supernatural movement of God's Spirit the formation of Christian holiness in man. "It does no more than imply, though it does imply, his uncatholic opinions:" this is Newman's estimate of the letter.

The next scene in the controversy was opened by means of

what might seem an insignificant event—the arrival of a young Spanish priest in the port of Hippo. Paulus Orosius of Tarragona, a maritime city then the capital of one of the three Spanish provinces, was doubtless but one among many Catholic ecclesiastics who experienced the hostility, and retreated before the attacks, of the Arian Visigoths, Vandals, Alans, and Sueves, who had lately invaded the peninsula. He was driven from his home, had a very narrow escape for his life, and was thankful to find a refuge in the “kindly bosom” of Roman Africa. But, as he himself expresses it, he was “more grievously wounded by the presence of false teachers” than by the fiercest foes. Two of his fellow-citizens, each bearing the name of Avitus, had travelled to the East in consequence of the Priscillianist controversy, and had brought back Origenistic opinions, which in part corrected the Spanish heresy, but in part, as Orosius thought, were equally unsound. He was startled by hearing of the pre-existence and original equality of all spiritual beings; of the series of ministrations discharged in various periods by the Son of God; of the temporary and purgatorial character of the so-called “eternal fire,” and even of the ultimate salvation of Satan himself. “A strong inward impulse,” as he himself tells us, led him to choose his new abode with reference to the best opportunities of theological instruction. Why not go straight to Hippo, and settle himself where he could consult the great bishop Augustine? He acted on the thought. He reached Hippo, apparently at the beginning of 415, and found that two Spanish bishops had already asked Augustine’s opinion on certain forms of error. Unfeignedly desirous of getting at the truth, and of “becoming a vessel meet for use in the Lord’s house,” Orosius wrote and presented to Augustine a memorial respecting Origenism and Priscillianism. Augustine wrote a short treatise in answer. On Priscillianism he was content to refer Orosius to his own writings against the parent error of Manicheism; on Origenism he was more diffuse, and distinctly rejected the Universalist gloss which made “eternal” mean no more than “long-continued.” On some points of Origenistic speculation, he took occasion to warn his young friend against the attempt to know what could not be known; and he concluded by affectionately commending him to the “One true Teacher” who could read his heart, and who had given him that “love” wherewith he was “knocking” for fuller knowledge.

Among the questions which had perplexed Orosius was that

of the origin and nature of the soul. Augustine had long been interested in this inquiry. Some twenty-six years before, when writing "*On Free Will*," he had discussed various theories on the subject; quite recently, in a correspondence with a bishop Evodius, he had considered the conditions of the soul's existence after death; and Jerome had advised the late "tribune" Marcellinus to ask Augustine's opinion as to the soul's origin, especially whether each soul was created and then embodied, or whether, as most of the Westerns thought, it was transmitted by descent—the question, as it was afterwards put, between Creationism and Traducianism. Augustine took the opportunity of Orosius's presence in Africa to open communications with Jerome on the matter. He advised Orosius to go to Palestine, consult Jerome, and bring his answer back; and he sent to Jerome, by Orosius, a long letter on the "*Origin of the Soul*," in which, after stating what he thought certain on the subject, *i.e.* that the soul was not part of God, nor, in the ordinary sense, corporeal, and that it had lapsed into sin by its own fault, he asked his friend, whom he knew to be sound on the point of "*original sin*," to tell him when or where that sin was "*contracted*," and intimated the difficulty that he found in adopting, with Jerome, the Creationist theory, in view of the sufferings of infants and of their condemnation if unbaptized. In another letter he asked Jerome what he thought of the relation of sins to each other; whether, as he rejected that Stoic theory of their equality which had been advocated by Jovinian, he also rejected the notion of the inseparable connexion of virtues. Granting, said Augustine, that virtues are inseparable, it does not follow that vices are; one vice, in fact, is sometimes removed by another; and the words of St. James (ii. 10) might well mean that every sin is an offence against the one principle of charity.

With these two letters to Jerome, and with a copy of the letter in reply to Hilarius, Orosius arrived in Palestine about midsummer in 415. He found himself speedily involved in the discussion, not of the origin of the soul, but of the questions raised by Pelagius. For Jerome had begun to attack the Pelagian theory of sinlessness, in a letter to an inquirer named Ctesiphon; he traced the new opinions to pagan philosophy, insisted that according to Scripture no man had ever lived "*without sin*" (the phrase used by the new school instead of "*sinless*," which the Eastern Churches would not have endured), and accused the

Pelagians of using "grace" as a mere synonym for natural free-will and for moral precepts given in God's law. He denounced Coelestius's "thorny syllogisms" or "definitions," which exhibited Pelagianism in a series of sharp logical formulas; repelled the imputation of Manicheism, freely made by Pelagians against their opponents, as if the belief in the corruption of nature implied that it had not been created good; declared that to assert the Fall and the need of real grace was not to call nature evil, nor to deny, explicitly or virtually, freewill in man. And when Orosius arrived at Bethlehem, he found Jerome engaged on a larger work against the Pelagians—his *Dialogues*, in three books, between Atticus, "a Catholic," and Critobulus, "a heretic" who, curiously enough, is made to complain of his opponent's "dialectical" sophistry. Critobulus is charged with saying, "Man can avoid sin if he will." "True," he answers, "but of course 'by the grace of God' must be understood; to say that sin could be avoided without it were sacrilege." But he is soon shown to use "grace" evasively, and to deny man's moral dependence, for each particular good action, upon a present help from above such as is "besought throughout the Psalter." The question of sinlessness, as usual, comes up. Critobulus adduces some texts from Scripture, including 1 John iii. 9, and Atticus interprets them in conformity to the natural sense of such a text as 1 John i. 8. He points to the future of the saved as the only sphere of true moral "perfection;" and it is remarkable that he treats the rebuke addressed by St. Paul to St. Peter as real and deserved. He criticizes some passages in Pelagius's work, before mentioned, called "*Capitula*" (Jerome characteristically makes him remark that a Christian teacher must often say unpleasant things); he insists that men might be "righteous," yet not actually "sinless;" and, in reply to the assertion that "a man can easily keep God's commandments if he chooses," he indignantly denies that Christian precepts are so "easy" of fulfilment, inasmuch as some cases of ignorance are said to involve sin, and to follow the Crucified is no child's play. He accuses his opponent of Jovinianism on the subject of baptism, as if it ensured the recipient against any future lapse; he endeavours to meet the argument, "On your showing, God causes the sins of men whom He refuses to aid," by asking whether it might not be pushed into atheism on the ground of God's permission of evil; he declares that "Adam did not sin because God foreknew that he would, but God foreknew that he would thus

abuse his freedom ;” he upholds the reality of that freedom in consistency with the facts of man’s weakness and God’s power ; he censures Pelagius’s letter to Demetrias, and his alleged letter to a widow, as tainted by Pharisaic arrogance ; and concludes by broadly asserting that all infants are born in sin, by referring his adversary to certain writings of “the holy and eloquent bishop Augustine,” and by associating Pelagianism with Origenistic “error” on the pre-existence of human souls.

Such were the thoughts that occupied the great student of Bethlehem when Orosius—“a poor unknown foreigner,” as he describes himself—came thither “at Father Augustine’s bidding, to learn the fear of the Lord while sitting at Jerome’s feet.” He had thought to remain there unnoticed, but he found himself summoned by the priests of Jerusalem to attend a meeting at their church, for the consideration of the Pelagian difficulty. Their bishop was the same John who had been, as we remember, at feud with Epiphanius and Jerome on the Origenistic controversy ; and Jerome, in 400, had sneered at him as “a supercilious prelate who fancied himself the only wise and eloquent man in the world.” Naturally John regarded his widely renowned neighbour as a scholar who had gone over to a party of obscurantists ; and he was evidently indisposed to agree with him, or even with Augustine, about Pelagius. But still he courteously directed the Spanish priest who might represent their minds, and had come fresh from their influence, to take his seat among the assembled clergy. This diocesan synod, as we may call it, was held on July 28, 415. All the presbyters at once desired Orosius to tell what he knew of the African Church proceedings in regard to Pelagius or Cœlestius. He obeyed ; and added that Augustine was then at work on a treatise against Pelagius, *i.e.* the book “On Nature and Grace.” “I have also here a letter written by him to a Sicilian,” *i.e.* to Hilarius, “which discusses several opinions of the heretics.” “Read it to us.” Orosius thereupon read the letter in question. After this, John desired that Pelagius might be brought in. He entered accordingly ; a tall, stout, broad-shouldered man, whose appearance, as Orosius sarcastically intimates, did not suggest any idea of ascetic self-discipline, but whose confident bearing would at once show the assembly that he came prepared to hold his own. His first words were decisive on this point : being asked whether he owned to have taught the doctrines which Augustine had controverted, *e.g.* the possibility, or even the

facility, of sinlessness, the denial of original sin, etc., he answered, "And what is Augustine to me?" Forthwith an outcry arose: "He insults the bishop whom God employed to restore Church unity in Africa!" "Turn him out," exclaimed some; "Excommunicate him," cried others. But the bishop interposed—with tranquil dignity, as would be said by a friend of Pelagius, although Orosius, who was in a state of sensitive excitement, saw in his conduct the temper of a partisan. He bade Pelagius take a seat—"a layman," says the indignant Spaniard in his narrative, "among presbyters, a manifest heretic in the midst of Catholics;" but John was determined to show his independence of any African precedents, and said significantly, "*I am Augustine here.*" Orosius, unabashed, and naturally mortified by the turn which matters were taking, said very bluntly, "If you represent Augustine, follow his sentiments." The bishop gravely asked whether the statements complained of were imputed to Pelagius personally, or to others; if to Pelagius himself, let him be distinctly charged with having said this or that. Orosius was quite ready: "Pelagius has told me"—he did not say where or when—"that man can be without sin, and easily keep God's commandments, if he pleases." "I cannot deny," said Pelagius, "that I have said this, and do say this." Orosius rejoined that this proposition had been condemned, when asserted by Cœlestius, in the African synod, and had been censured by Augustine and by "blessed Jerome," whose letter to Ctesiphon he referred to, and withal mentioned the work on which Jerome was then engaged, and in which he was "grasping the slippery dragon with a hook, so that it could not wriggle away"—alluding to Job xli. 1 [xl. 20] in LXX. Unmoved by this vehemence, the old bishop called on Orosius and others who supported him to take up the formal position of accusers of Pelagius; but they refused, on the ground that they were simply informing him, as bishop of Jerusalem, on the subject of previous episcopal judgments condemning this "layman's" heresy: an answer which could not satisfy John, for Pelagius at any rate, had not, like Cœlestius, been formally tried and condemned by any synod. Orosius intimates that the bishop went on to talk in an "Origenizing" strain on the possibility of sinlessness, but that he himself adhered to his position as a simple narrator of the African Church proceedings. "I am a son of the Catholic Church: do not ask me, Father, to set myself up as a teacher above teachers. Fathers approved by the whole Church and in communion with you have pronounced

these opinions heretical: I bow to their sentence. Why ask a son's opinion, when you hear his father's decision?" The hot-headed Spaniard was spoiling his case by treating the sentence of one provincial Church against one person as superseding all trial of his associate by the bishops of another Church—an utterly untenable claim, which John would of course resent. A long discussion followed, and Orosius tells us that his words suffered from mistranslation, omission, and even interpolation, on the part of the person employed to put them into Greek; so that he was at some disadvantage. The point of "sinlessness" being raised, Pelagius put his opinion into this form: "I do *not* say that man's nature has been endowed with a capacity of being free of sin, but that, if he will strive and labour for his own salvation, God gives him this power to be free." Thereupon some voices muttered, "He did say, 'Without God's grace a man can become perfect;'" and forthwith, as "blaming such a statement," bishop John cited the text, 1 Cor. xv. 10, in which God's grace was expressly mentioned—meaning that Pelagius would surely accept that language. Pelagius thereupon said, "Anathema to him who teaches that man can become perfect without God's aid"—a clearer term, it might be said, than "grace," and yet itself capable of being used evasively. "Is not this enough?" asked the bishop. "If he had said it was possible without God's aid, that would indeed have been heresy; but now, when he says, 'Not without God's aid,' what do you say against him? Do you," he added ironically, "deny God's aid?" "No, assuredly," said Orosius; "I anathematize those who deny it. I am asserting it against heretics; but," he proceeded, thinking that John was a partisan of Pelagius, and feeling impatient at the misstatements of the interpreters of his Latin, "the heretic is a Latin—I am a Latin—the question should be left to Latin judges;" and other voices had the boldness to challenge the bishop as disqualified, by his partiality, for the task of judging the cause. The hearers were apparently perplexed, and could get no further than the resolutions to write to Pope Innocent and engage to abide by his decision, to impose silence on Pelagius, and also to forbid all reproachful language towards the bishop himself. Thereupon "the Eucharist was celebrated, the kiss of peace exchanged, and all joined in common prayer."

And so the Jerusalem conference broke up, having done no more than barely indicate the underlying issue, whether divine help for human conduct "was to be expected through

the channel of nature or through the channel of grace." Nearly seven weeks passed away; the great anniversary festival of the dedication of the Cathedral of Jerusalem came round on September 13th. Orosius went to pay his respects to the bishop, and was astounded at being repulsed as "a blasphemer." "When did I ever utter a blasphemy?" "I heard you say that not even with God's aid could a man be without sin." "I never said anything of the kind," returned Orosius; "if I was heard to say it, why was I not at once checked and called to account?" He preferred, as he himself says, to suppose that the interpreter had done him injustice, rather than to impute wilful calumny to John; but he set himself to write a "Defence"—the pamphlet from which we have derived so much information, and which he addressed to a body of "priests," apparently the presbyters of Jerusalem. He is constrained, he says at the outset, in justice to himself, to write in open denunciation of Pelagius and Cœlestius, in whose persons Origen, Priscillian, Jovinian, are again alive for the detriment of the Church. He recounts recent events, appeals to "the Most High Trinity of Almighty God, and to all His Catholic servants," in vindication of his own honesty, when he utterly disclaims the words ascribed to him by the bishop; affirms his full belief in Divine Omnipotence; notices Pelagius's change of language from "Man can, if he wills, be sinless," to "Man can be sinless with God's aid;" criticizes the amended formula, however explained; affirms that One Man only could be sinless—not from defect in divine power to make men sinless, but from the condition of frail humanity; remarks on facts which show that no man has all virtues; explains the Scripture phrase "just men" as used relatively; asserts the continual present bestowal of divine help, but refers the bestowal of absolute sinlessness to the future consummation of the redeemed; declares that he and all Catholics regard nature not as "evil," but as "weakened," and do not suppose God to have commanded what was impossible, but rather to assist man's weakness by grace. Orosius concludes by protesting that he hates the heresy, not the heretic; but that he must needs avoid the heretic because of the heresy: "Let him only condemn it by word, and under his hand, and he will be united to us all in the bond of brotherhood."

A brief interval of quiet was followed by another collision between the contending parties. Two Gallic bishops, Heros and Lazarus, had for some reasons been expelled from the sees of Arles

and Aix. They are afterwards unfavourably described by Zosimus, when bishop of Rome; but it may be supposed that the real cause of prejudice against them was that they were favourites of the usurper Constantine, who had reigned for some years over Gaul, Spain, and Britain, and had been put to death in 411 after attempting to save himself by receiving ordination as a priest. Whether or not it were true that Lazarus had repeatedly "slandered the innocent," that Heros had tyrannized over his clergy, that both had resigned their sees, we find them preparing formal accusations against Pelagius and Coelestius at the end of 415, when a synod of fourteen bishops was summoned to meet at Diospolis, the ancient Lydda, under the presidency of Eulogius of Cæsarea as metropolitan of Palestine. It met on the 20th of December. Neither of the two Gallic prelates appeared, because one of them was ill, and the other excused himself on the ground that he could not leave him: but their "libellus" was read and interpreted, and Pelagius was questioned on the matters alleged against him. He had a very favourable opportunity, which he knew how to make use of, and he took care to produce a brief but very courteous letter received about two years before from Augustine. John of Jerusalem helped him somewhat by giving an account of the recent conference, not without reflections on Orosius and other anti-Pelagians; and thus the bishops were disposed to judge him favourably when he explained the sense in which, as he said, he had used the words complained of in the memorial, "A man could not be without sin unless he had a knowledge of the law." "I did not mean," he said, "that he who had the knowledge of the Law of God could not sin, but that he was greatly helped by such knowledge to avoid sin," alluding to the LXX. of Isa. viii. 20, "He gave a law for help." "That," said the bishops, "is not contrary to Church doctrine. Let another article be read." "Pelagius," so ran the memorial, "has said that all men are ruled by their own will"—a statement which Augustine supposed to exclude divine ruling. "Yes," said Pelagius, "for we have free-will, and God helps it to choose good." "This also is not contrary to Church doctrine." A third and certainly rather captious accusation was brought forward. When Pelagius was asked why he had said that "sinners should burn eternally," it was easy for him to quote Matt. xxv. 46; the accusers had taken up this point as if to show that he made no distinction between sinners who had, and sinners who had not, rested on Christ the Foundation. "To

deny eternal punishment," added Pelagius, "is Origenism;" and the Council, of course, approved. "Next, he says that evil does not so much as come into the thoughts of good men." "I only said, they ought to study to avoid evil thoughts." This was accepted—naturally, says Augustine; but he adds, to say that evil does not come into a good man's thoughts, in the sense of presenting itself without being entertained, is not true. "A fifth point: Pelagius said, 'Even in the Old Testament the Kingdom of Heaven was promised.'" "Well, I followed the authority of Daniel (vii. 18)." "This is not heterodox," said the bishops. "Sixth: he said, 'A man can be sinless if he pleases,' and he wrote to a widow in terms which encourage self-righteousness"—which were recited, *e.g.* the recommendation so to live as to be able to say, "Lord, Thou knowest how holy are these hands," etc. Pelagius again explained: "I did not say that any man had been sinless all his life, but that a man converted from sins might keep out of sin, by his own labour *and* God's grace, but not so as to be incapable of falling away. As for the other passages, they are not mine; I have never said anything of the kind." The Council welcomed this recognition of "God's grace," which was combined with the requirement of labour (thus implicitly excluding "facility"), and which was accompanied by an anathema against those who wrote the words disclaimed, but "as fools, not as heretics." After these six articles, six others came on, which were taken from the language of Coelestius as condemned by the Council of Carthage; and three more which Hilarius had sent to Augustine from Sicily. Pelagius, briefly referring to the first Sicilian proposition, which he had explained, selected for special remark the fourth Cœlestian article, "That (according to Cœlestius) there were men who lived sinlessly before Christ's coming. No, I say, according to Scripture, there were *holy* men in those days. The other statements are not mine; but to satisfy the holy synod, I anathematize those who hold or ever held them." Thus he condemned the assertion that Adam's sin harmed himself only, and did not compromise his descendants from their birth—and other kindred positions, seven in all. Another point was taken: "Pelagius says, 'The Church *here* is spotless.'" "So she is," he answered, with a most transparent evasion; "she is sanctified by baptism." The accusers now took exception to some passages, quoted, according to the sense rather than the words, from a book by Cœlestius, or, at any rate, alleged to be by him, and asked what Pelagius had to say of them. They were

ten in number: (1) "We do more than Law and Gospel require." Pelagius explained: "Paul said in one case, 'I have no commandment from the Lord.'" (2) "God's grace and help are not given for each several act, but consist in freewill, or in the Law and (moral) teaching." (3) "Grace is given according to, or in view of, men's previous good acts, therefore it depends on my will to deserve grace, or not." (4) "If all is done by grace, then, if I sin, God Himself is the cause of my sin, by not giving me grace." Pelagius professed that he disowned these three propositions, of which the second (No. 3 of the series) has been taken as essential to his theory. "The holy Council," said the bishops, "accepts you because you condemn such reprobate words." (5) "All men have *all* graces and virtues, not different ones." "We did say this," said Pelagius, "but they malignantly and ignorantly perverted it; we meant, God gives all graces to those who are worthy to receive them, as He gave them to St. Paul." (6) "Only the sinless can be called sons of God." (7) "Forgetfulness and ignorance, being involuntary, do not come under the head of sin." (8) "The will is not free if it needs God's help." (9) "Our victory over sin is not from God's help, but from our own will"—an inference from the actual words, which were somewhat less pointed, "The victory is ours because we took up arms by our own free will"—"and since we are partakers of the divine nature, *if* the soul *cannot* be sinless, God is subject to sin, because the soul, a part of Him, is so." One learns, however, that this article misrepresents the case, as if the writer really asserted Pantheism; whereas what he said was, "How can any one become partaker of that from the condition of which he is said to be alien?" (10) "Penitents are pardoned, not in consideration of God's mercy, but in consideration of their own labours and merits." The Council, when all were read through, said, "What says the monk Pelagius, here present, to these articles? For they are condemned by the holy Council, and by God's holy Catholic Church." Pelagius answered, "These statements, I again say, are not mine; I am not bound to answer for them. What I have maintained, I will uphold as sound; what is not mine, I condemn according to the judgment of the holy Church, anathematizing every one who contravenes her doctrines. For I believe in the Trinity" (*i.e.* the triple Personality) "of One Divine Essence, and all the doctrines of the holy Catholic Church; and if any one thinks otherwise, let him be anathema!"

What could the synod say, when matters came to this point, but that Pelagius, having given satisfaction on the matters alleged, and condemned all that was against the Church's faith, must be acknowledged as within the Church's communion? This, in fact, was the decision. Pelagius had explained some ten propositions, and disclaimed and rejected some sixteen; there had been no means of cross-examining him, or probing his real tenets, or clearing away all ambiguities; the Greek prelates, as Tillemont says, had been incompetent to estimate the real force of Latin propositions, and were naturally glad to close a painful and perplexing inquiry by giving credence to softenings and paraphrastic renderings of some statements, and to explicit rejections of others that sounded more offensive. After all, the two cardinal errors of Pelagianism, (1) the denial of the need of grace for each good act, and (2) the denial of the corruption of human nature as derived from Adam, had been thus rejected; and a general acceptance of all Church doctrines, to the exclusion of any others, might seem to cover the whole ground, and to guarantee the speaker's adherence to the principle of orthodoxy, and to all that this principle involved. The acquittal of Pelagius was, of course, *prima facie* a shock and a disappointment to those who viewed him as the originator of a destructive heresy; the fiery spirit of Jerome, some years later, expressed its indignation in the words, "the wretched synod of Diospolis!" But the greater and nobler Augustine acknowledged the good intentions of the bishops, while regarding them as deceived by disingenuous assurances: "they would have condemned Pelagius if he had not anathematized those errors;" "they *did*, in fact, condemn Pelagianism" when, taking Pelagius at his own word, they "acquitted him" personally and treated him as free from the errors which he disclaimed. In short, the acquittal, Augustine contends, was worthless as in favour of Pelagius, because he obtained it on false pretences; in fact, he "stole it by deceiving his judges;" and thus it was worth a great deal as *against* his tenets, for it was bestowed on the express understanding that they were condemned. Augustine does not scruple to say that when Pelagius in Palestine, through fear of condemnation, condemned the Pelagian cause, there Pelagianism fell—*ibi omnino cecidit hæresis vestra*. But this could only be said with reference to the ultimate condition of the party—to the moral ruin which the proceedings of Diospolis brought upon it: for the time, no doubt, the fact, patent and undeniable, that a Council in Palestine had

deliberately pronounced Pelagius orthodox, would greatly inspirit his friends and establish his credit ; and thus, regarded as an immediate success, it is a landmark in the history of his career.

As the course of the Pelagian history has led us into the East, it will be convenient to notice here two series of events in Eastern Church life, occurring at its two great centres of Alexandria and Antioch, which may be brought together as culminating in the year of the Conference of Jerusalem and the Council of Diospolis.

The first of these has its scene in Alexandria. Theophilus, as we have already learned, had died, after a long episcopate, in the autumn of 412, giving in his last words some reason to hope that he looked back with compunction on the worldly passions which had rendered his great abilities rather harmful than helpful to the cause of religion and of the Church. The lesson of his life is stern but salutary ; it is that religious zeal, however "genuine and active," will inevitably deteriorate under the trial of great power, if it is not salted with singleness of heart and with the self-suspicion which can detect the love of domination at work under a garb of churchly interest which seems to make its indulgence safe. The evil spirit which had haunted his administration seemed to linger for a while around his seat ; a fierce contest ensued between two competitors, one of whom was the archdeacon Timothy, the other the late archbishop's nephew Cyril. In meeting for the first time with the famous name of Cyril of Alexandria, it is impossible not to observe that his relationship to Theophilus had exercised in some respects a baneful influence on his mind. A course of ascetic training among the monks of Nitria had, indeed, been followed by a period of clerical usefulness, as priest and preacher in the Alexandrian Church. But when, after a brief contest which threatened sedition—a prospect always terrible in that turbulent capital—"the party of Cyril prevailed," the hasty and violent actions which distinguished the beginning of his episcopate might seem to foretell "a repetition of the outrages of Theophilus," a similar series of acts in which could be discerned the one purpose of upholding Church power in disregard of all other considerations, even when that power was being abused in the interest of personal ambition. "He came to the episcopate," says Socrates, "on the third day after Theophilus's death, with greater power than Theophilus himself had ever wielded ; for from that time the episcopate of Alexandria, going beyond the line of episcopal functions, began

to domineer even in secular affairs." Cyril was, indeed, from the first, animated by a spirit more simply ecclesiastical than had determined his uncle's course. He longed to see the kingdom of Christ asserting itself visibly and majestically before the world, confronting the forces of secular indifference, of sullen pagan hatred, of Jewish organization, of any sect that crossed its path. To secure this object, he was, to a great extent, incurious as to the legitimacy, in a Christian and spiritual sense, of means employed. If the world could not be overcome without the world's weapons—so he would be disposed to assert—it must be a weak fastidiousness that would make the Church decline to use them; he, the head of the Catholic community in such a city as Alexandria, amid such a population as that of Egypt, would have rough work to do, and must do it without faltering, without shrinking, in short, without over-delicate scrupulosity, such as, perhaps, might be approved or suggested by recluses who did not know what the world was, who had not his problems to solve, his difficulties to encounter.

So it was that he began his work by attacking the Novatians of Alexandria. A severe interpretation of the laws of Arcadius against "heretics" might bring these quiet sectarians, on whom Theodosius I. had bestowed like privileges with the Church, into that obnoxious category; and Cyril was not likely to interpret such laws otherwise than severely. He proceeded to extremities which contrast very unfavourably with the conduct of the Constantinopolitan bishop Atticus. "He closed the Novatianist churches, seized on all their sacred furniture, and even deprived their bishop Theopemptus of all that he had." His action brought ultimately its own retribution: for he incurred on this account the hostility of Socrates, who had a strong bias in favour, not actually of Novatianism, but of Novatians, and it is Socrates's history of some later events which has done so much to load Cyril's name with odium.

In 414, within the second year of his episcopate, he "exerted himself against the Jews, and certainly not without great provocation." Since the ruin of Jewish hopes at the death of Julian in 363, the nation had on the whole been exempt from serious interference or disturbance on the part of its Christian rulers. All attacks on Jewish synagogues had been prohibited by Theodosius I. in 393, by Arcadius in 397, by Honorius and Theodosius II. in 412; Honorius, moreover (although he excluded

Jews and Samaritans from serving as imperial "agents" or emissaries), forbade all interference with Jewish observance of the sabbath, "on pretext of public or private business: the claims of the (civil) law," he said, "were satisfied by the remaining time." They were allowed to retain unmolested an elaborate national organization. At Babylon there resided "the Prince of the Captivity;" but superior to him, and immediately supreme over the Jews of the Empire, was the Patriarch at Tiberias, with his council of "apostles," as Epiphanius tells us, continually attached to his person. These "apostles" used to collect tribute for their chief from the Jews throughout the empire; Honorius, indeed, in 399, forbade its exaction in the West, but five years afterwards recalled his prohibition. Theodosius I. had enacted that no Jews excommunicated by their own religious authorities should be reinstated by government intervention. Arcadius had ruled that the price of goods sold by Jews should be fixed by their own authorities, not by a Christian magistrate; and had prohibited all manifestations of disrespect towards their "illustrious patriarchs." Security and legal privileges emboldened the Jews to such a degree that Chrysostom, while yet a priest of Antioch, had to denounce the growing disposition of professing Christians to frequent the synagogue and take part in Jewish feasts or fasts. From his language we infer that, as of old in Galatia, Judaism was exercising a strange "fascination" over many half-instructed Christians. The Jewish worship had the charm of mystery and romance; the synagogue was thought a venerable place, where people could hear an impressive service and see the sacred manuscripts of the Hebrew Scriptures; an oath taken there, it was said, had a special sanctity, and spells could be procured there which no malady could resist. Chrysostom was thoroughly alarmed and indignant at the numbers that flocked to the festivals of "Trumpets" or "Tabernacles," or fasted even on Easter Sunday, if it fell just before the day of the Jewish Passover; he made himself literally "hoarse" with fulminating against the "impious Jewish fasts," which were worse in effect than "drunken revelry," and never tired of reminding his hearers that the difference between Judaism and Christianity was not superficial but vital. "Henceforth," he cried, in one of these discourses, "if any one of you observe a Jewish custom, small or great, *I* will be clear of your blood!" We may remember how Ambrose, by his pertinacity, once wrung from Theodosius I. the revocation of an order for the rebuilding

of a burnt synagogue: to his mind, Judaism was no enfeebled and contemptible enemy, but a formidable and defiant one; and we have evidence that its "insolence," in some places, took a highly offensive form. At the feast of Purim, the figure of Haman hung on a gibbet was generally understood to be "a covert representation of the Crucifixion;" and on this account the exhibition had been prohibited in the East, on pain of forfeiture of all Jewish privileges, four years before the accession of Cyril.

The Jewish patriarch Gamaliel had, in the opinion of the imperial government, abused his privileges, and was on the point of having them curtailed, at the moment when Cyril became involved in his contest with the Jewish community in Alexandria. That formidable body had, in the days of Philo, occupied two of the five "regions" of the city, had broken forth into rebellion under Trajan, had been put down with a fury inspired by serious alarm, had again, apparently, flourished under its own Genarch or Ethnarch, and in the Arian times had, as if by a true instinct, joined with the pagans on the side of the Arian usurper Gregory, and committed outrages which Athanasius shrinks from relating, but which, no doubt, were recorded by a tradition of horror extending to the days of Cyril. It is curious that the occasion for a new feud was given by the lax and irreligious Jews, rather than by the fanatical; we seem to be taken back to the old times of the Syrian supremacy and to the reign of Herod the Great, when we hear that the heathenish attractions of the theatre drew thither many Jews on the sabbath day, and produced an increase of public disorder by the inevitable collision between them and the "Greeks." Orestes the prefect, a Christian in name rather than in reality, set up an official notice, called a "polity," in the theatre, for the purpose of securing order. Some of the adherents of Cyril had come to the spot with a view to informing themselves as to the new regulations; and among them was Hierax, a teacher of the rudiments of grammar, and a constant applauder of the archbishop's sermons. The sight of this man raised a cry among the Jews: "He is come to excite a disturbance!" Orestes, jealous of Cyril's power, took advantage of this complaint, and, without further ado, put Hierax then and there to the torture. The archbishop, hearing of this, sent for the leading Jews, and threatened them—a course which only intensified the bitterness of the Jewish population. They conceived a plan for attacking the Christians at night, and agreed to wear, as a distinguishing mark, rings made

of the bark of the palm tree. The appointed night arrived; a loud cry was heard all over the city: "A fire, a fire, at Alexander's church!" The unsuspecting Christians rushed to the place and were slaughtered by their enemies; whereupon Cyril, next day, went at the head of a great force to the synagogues, took possession of them, drove the Jews fairly out of Alexandria, and allowed the populace to pillage their houses. If Cyril had heard any remonstrant voice, he would doubtless have answered, "I take the law into my own hand, because there is no justice to be had at the hand of Orestes." But he would have had a very strong case for invoking the Emperor if the prefect had passed over such an outrage as a massacre of Christians by Jews. As it was, his own violence naturally involved him in fresh trouble; he had to counterwork the prefect's influence, exerted against him at Constantinople; he must have felt that he had put himself in the wrong, for he made overtures to Orestes, at the people's urgency, and after they had proved vain, went to him and held out the Gospel-book: but Orestes had got his advantage and would not hear of reconciliation. On this, about five hundred of the Nitrian monks, ardent in the cause of their "Pope," hastened to Alexandria, met Orestes in his chariot, and shouted out, "Pagan! idolater!" "I am a Christian," said he, in some alarm at the wild-looking troop; "I was baptized by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople." Then it was that a monk, named Ammonius, threw a stone at Orestes, and wounded him in the head. The outrage was avenged by tortures so acute that Ammonius died under the infliction; whereupon Cyril took the inconceivably foolish, and indeed unchristian, step of burying him with the honours of a martyr and under the name of "Thaumasius," a step of which he was soon ashamed.

Such was the second act of this unhappy drama; the third was more tragical—was, in truth, hideous. The female philosopher Hypatia, whom Synesius had addressed in extravagant terms of homage, was still, in middle life, continuing to teach the Neo-Platonic theosophy, and represented the cause of pagan thought with a self-possessed dignity that was not less impressive than her eloquence. The mysticism—call it monotheistic or pantheistic—of Plotinus inspired her with a genuine enthusiasm; in her a refined and etherealised paganism had found its prophetess, and perhaps might find its restorer. We can imagine the gloomy abhorrence with which she would be scanned by the Christian

populace, which would detect the enemy's craft in this seductive heathenish intellectualism. Through many a group of rough zealots the murmur passed, gathering force and purpose on its way, "'Tis Hypatia that keeps Orestes from being reconciled to Pope Cyril!" A reader named Peter stirred up his companions; they waited for Hypatia with as fell a resolve as ever steeled fanatics against pity. She was coming home in her chariot; they dragged her forth, bore her into the very stronghold of Alexandrian Christianity, the grand Cæsarean Church, and murdered her with every circumstance of brutal cruelty, concluding their work by tearing the corpse limb from limb, and burning it at a place called Cinaron. Such was the deed which, in the grave language of Socrates, "brought no small blame on Cyril and on the Church of the Alexandrians;" words which do not imply that Cyril personally had any share in the crime, but rather that he, the head of the Catholic body in Alexandria, and that body itself, were in a manner compromised by such a deed done in the face of day, in a most sacred place, during Lent—it was the Lent of 415—by Alexandrian Churchmen under the leadership of one of their own clergy. No credence need be given to the tale of the heathen writer Damascius, a century later, that Cyril, moved by jealousy, had planned the murder: but quite apart from this, Cyril's fault was serious enough; he had let loose these savage spirits when he went forth to avenge on the Jews the midnight massacre of his people; he had forgotten what spirit he was of—had thought to uphold the Church by sheer force, and had practically encouraged his fierce myrmidons to think such force hallowed by the use of her name. They were rough, hard-handed men, these "Parabolani"—so called because they "hazarded their lives" in attendance on the infected sick—unsoftened by what might seem a life of self-sacrificing charity, and fired with a militant zeal which, being "self-willed" from the first, might explode in some terrible moments into sheer devilry. They outwent his example, they bettered his instructions, but he was not clear of their guilt; and we cannot be surprised that in the next year the Alexandrians memorialised Theodosius against their excesses, and obtained a law which subjected them to certain restraints.

Far different was the scene which, apparently in 415, or in the year preceding or following, exhibited at Antioch a signal triumph of patient, generous, and peace-making charity over the remaining

forces of an inveterate dissension. The schism of Antioch had lasted about fifty-three years, reckoning from the consecration of Paulinus, and eighty-five years from the original occasion of it as given by the expulsion of Eustathius. After the death of Paulinus's successor Evagrius, the Eustathian or "Old Church party," which had once been strong through the support of Athanasius, found it impossible to obtain another bishop. Still, however, they stood out against acknowledging Flavian; and while Porphyrius disgraced the throne of Antioch, they would probably thank God that they were not polluted by his communion. But in 413 Porphyrius was succeeded by the pious and gentle-hearted Alexander, who set himself to the task of healing the schism. The moral force of his character added weight to his exhortations: after a while the Eustathians gave way. So Alexander, at the head of his own clergy and laity, proceeded to their place of meeting, and joined with them in their psalmody; then, in Theodoret's graphic language, "forming one body of melody from the united worshippers, he filled the whole Agora, from the West gate to the Great Church, with a vast stream of men resembling the river that flowed beside the city." As the majestic procession swept along, pouring forth its choral thanksgivings for the blessing of restored unity, the Jews, we are told, with the Arians and the little remnant of pagans, groaned and lamented at seeing the "other streams" thus flowing into the "sea" of the Church.

Alexander gave token of his Christian spirit by another act which well became a successor of Flavian; he restored the name of "John, bishop of Constantinople," to the "diptychs" of his church, the rolls in which were inscribed the names of prelates departed in Church communion. He also reinstated in their churches two "Joannite" bishops of Syria without putting any questions to them; and on informing Innocent of these proceedings, received from him a warm fraternal response. The Pope—at the suggestion, as he told Alexander, of John Cassian—recognised some Eustathian clerics, residing in Italy, as belonging to the clergy of Antioch; and gladly accepted the communion of the Antiochene Church, acknowledging that "the fellow-disciples of the Apostolic see had been the first to show to other Churches the way of peace, on which," he added, "you and we being firmly settled, shall be embraced and strengthened by the goodness of Christ our Lord." Acacius of Beroëa, writing to Innocent, had expressed (one cannot think sincerely) his acquiescence in the reunion of the

Eustathians and the restoration of the Joannites. Innocent replied with grave significant brevity: he would grant his communion to Acacius on condition that he frankly laid aside all grounds of complaint in the affair of "holy John, that admirable bishop," and with his own lips signified to Alexander his acceptance of these terms. Alexander's efforts in regard to the memory of Chrysostom were not confined to Antioch: he visited Constantinople, and tried to win over Atticus; but that prelate was for the time obstinate, although he yielded somewhat later in fear of public opinion at Constantinople and in deference to his Emperor's remark, "There can be no great harm in writing a dead man's name on a tablet for the sake of peace." After giving way himself, Atticus tried to persuade Cyril that it would be only a matter of ranking Chrysostom among departed Churchmen, not of admitting that he died a legitimate bishop. But Cyril was Theophilus's nephew, and flatly refused to concede the point; he saw through the evasion suggested, and would not stoop to a quibble; he replied that he dared not violate the canons: yet he too yielded to pressure before the spring of 418.

Alexander also consulted Innocent as to a difficulty in relation to the Church of Cyprus. The bishops of that island, while "distressed" by the supremacy of Arianism at Antioch, had disregarded the sixth Nicene canon by filling up their number on their own sole authority. Innocent replied that as the Nicene Council had established the authority of the "original see of Peter" at Antioch over a whole "diocese," or group of provinces, he would advise the bishops of Cyprus to procure Alexander's approval for episcopal consecrations within their island. Alexander should not only ordain metropolitans, but his assent should be needful for consecrations of simple bishops; a rule, says Tillemont, which "gave a great authority to patriarchs and enfeebled the authority of metropolitans." Alexander had also asked whether, when imperial authority had divided a province into two, and thus founded a new civil metropolis, the Church ought to accept that arrangement for herself. Innocent answered characteristically, "No! it is not fit that the Church should change her system according to the momentary requirements of state policy." In this he was but following the precedent set by Damasus in regard to Eastern Illyricum; and the principle thus laid down may have an interest for us, as having been in effect asserted by the see of York when in the twelfth century it claimed jurisdiction over the

bishops of Scotland: but its practical inconvenience, its tendency to produce political complications, was only too manifest. Lastly, Alexander had doubted how to treat Arian clerics on their conversion: he was advised to act on the principle suggested by the now established rule as to lay converts from heresy. Such persons were acknowledged as baptized, but were required to accept Confirmation, for in their heresy they could not have "received the Holy Spirit;" and thus clerical converts ought not to be recognised as having received the Holy Spirit in Ordination, but must take their place as simple laymen—a decision which later Church law has in effect set aside.

Alexander had but a short episcopate, although the year of his death has been variously stated within the limits 416–421; but he certainly "in a short time fulfilled a long time," and his few years, as Tillemont says, were of more value to the true interests of the Church than fifty years of many another prelate.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE DECLINE OF PELAGIANISM.

THE Council of Diospolis had left Pelagius for the moment triumphant in the East. He followed it up by a letter which Augustine describes as full of vanity and "carnal elation;" but we cannot wonder that he made the very utmost of the favourable sentence pronounced by the bishops of Palestine, nor, all things considered, that in doing so he did not confine himself to the strict truth. They had approved, he said, his assertion that "man could easily live without sin." The fact was, that the word "easily" had somehow dropped out of the quotation of his words as laid before the Council; and he chose to assume that this accident did not affect the sanction then given to his words. He also gave his own account of its proceedings in a pamphlet which Augustine calls "his paper of defence." It was brought to Africa by a deacon named Charus, himself a native of Hippo; and it produced some effect while the actual minutes of the Council continued unknown. He also wrote a work "On Freewill" in four books, in which, while verbally acknowledging and insisting upon grace as helping men "more easily" to obey, he reduced it to the impressiveness of Christ's example—in other words, to the highest form of hortatory instruction regarded as a signal bounty of God; thereby setting aside the whole idea of any divine assistance being granted to man in respect of will and action. This view of grace requires a word or two of comment. It strangely underrated the significance of the Christian type of character, which the New Testament traces to the Pentecostal gift. In effect, it went back behind Pentecost, and was untrue to the facts of spiritual life as they were present to the consciousness of St. Paul. Dean Church has condensed the issue raised into one concise sentence: "What men needed, what they had not, was power within them, and not only legions without them."

Pelagius's treatise was by way of reply to Jerome; but Jerome was now attacked by a writer who, as we have already seen, was perhaps ultimately responsible for the origin and dissemination of Pelagian Naturalism—Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia. This acute and learned prelate wrote, in the year 416, five books "against those who assert that men sin by nature, not by will." Extracts from this treatise, the title of which was ambiguous and therefore fallacious, show that Theodore denied altogether the whole doctrine of "original sin," as inconsistent with divine equity, and asserted that man was created mortal, earth destined to return to earth, by nature dust and ashes. And it appears from the account of the book as it was read to Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the ninth century, that Theodore attacked what he represented as a new heresy of Western growth, the invention of one "Haram"—meaning, of course, "Hieronymus" or Jerome—who was conceited about his knowledge of Hebrew, inaccurate as it was, and who had deceived whole Churches into believing (1) that sin comes not from choice, but from a corrupted nature; (2) that infants are tainted with sin from their birth, and that they receive the sacraments in order to its remission; (3) that no man is righteous; (4) that even Christ, since He took our nature (although, said Theodore, elsewhere these new teachers deny the reality of His Incarnation), could not have been sinless; (5) that marriage was the work of the corrupted nature. Theodore also spoke of a gift of sinlessness, which he called "remission of sins," but which, in effect, he reserved for the state of the risen and redeemed: "we shall sin no more after the resurrection." It is in order to *this*, he said, that infants are baptized; and Photius suggests that he took up this view by way of a *rationale* for infant baptism, in opposition to that which presupposed original sin. It appears that his "Haram" did not see this treatise—did not even know that it had been written against him. The animosity of Pelagius's adherents was, however, brought home to him by a furious attack on the recluses of Bethlehem, who were cruelly beaten and had the monastic buildings burned over their heads: a deacon was actually killed, and Jerome only escaped by taking shelter in a tower stronger than the rest of the buildings. No doubt these Pelagian zealots persuaded themselves that they were fighting for the honour of the Creator of humanity.

Meantime Orosius had returned to Africa, in the spring of 416, bringing with him letters from Heros and Lazarus, the accusers of

Pelagius and Cœlestius in the recent Palestinian Council. They informed the African Church that Pelagius was still at Jerusalem, and "was deceiving many, but was resisted by many more, pre-eminently by Jerome." The letters were read before a Council of sixty-nine bishops assembled at Carthage in the summer of that year. Thereupon it was resolved to refer to the records of Cœlestius's condemnation, which had taken place five years before. These having been read, the Council pronounced that the Pelagian leaders, "although Cœlestius was said to have in the interval attained the presbyterate," were deserving of anathema, "unless they would openly anathematize" the errors in question. A synodal letter (which ranks as the 179th in the Augustinian series) was written to Pope Innocent, in order that "the authority of the apostolic see" might reinforce that of the African Council. You, they say, preach these truths "with greater grace from the apostolic see"—a pious compliment, natural in their circumstances. The letter proceeds to inform Innocent that the so-called grace which the Pelagians acknowledged was either natural capacity, or assistance and right direction given to it by moral instruction and illumination of conscience; but true and proper grace, the grace of Christ working on the inner man as such, "the grace whereby we are Christians," they would not recognise at all. Even if the accounts circulated as to the Council of Palestine should satisfy Innocent that Pelagius personally had earned his acquittal, the error itself was energetic and far-spreading, was "maintained by many," and involved a contradiction of Christ's own words, and of the principles of the Church's worship as expressed in the episcopal benediction pronounced "over the people" at the Eucharist, "Grant them, O Lord, to be strengthened with might by Thy Spirit"—a prayer superfluous if nature were sufficient for moral purposes. And though Cœlestius had formerly admitted that infants were redeemed through baptism, many Pelagians did not hesitate to affirm, with greater consistency, that infants had no tainted nature and needed no redemption: baptized or unbaptized, they would equally be saved, for in fact they had never been lost. It was not, then, a question of the personal opinions of this or that individual, but of a widely diffused opposition to the doctrines of the Fall and of Grace. Another assembly of sixty-one bishops of Numidia, at Milevum, in which Augustine was included, adopted a similar letter, insisting on the two points, that Pelagius denied the necessity of divine assistance in order to

well-doing, and of baptism for the salvation of infants—points on which, they said, depended the entire Christian position. As against the theory that men could become sinless by the mere use of natural powers, they cited such texts as 1 Cor. x. 13. They expressed a hope that the Pelagians would yield to Innocent's "authority, derived from the authority of Holy Scripture:" a phrase which clearly seems to mean the weight of his doctrinal assertions as supported by apposite scriptural quotations.

There was some anxiety in Africa, we gather, as to the line which the Roman Church would take. Pelagius had lived long at Rome in high repute, without any censure on the part of Innocent: and there were Churchmen there (although Innocent professed not to know of them) who thought that he had been misrepresented, and who insisted on his recent acquittal as sufficient proof of his orthodoxy; there were also, it appears, some convinced Pelagians, one of whom met an African bishop's argument from "Lead us not into temptation" by remarking that "temptation" there meant a bodily mishap. Such considerations led Augustine, with Aurelius and three other bishops, to write a further letter to Innocent. The Pelagians, they say, practically tell their Creator, "Thou madest us men, but it is we who have made ourselves righteous." They lay stress on the essential naturalism of the theory by saying that the Pelagians called human nature free—but it was in order to avoid seeking for a Deliverer—and safe—by way of treating a Saviour as superfluous; and it can hardly be doubted that this pointed antithesis exhibited the actual issue raised: Was nature, as it existed, in need of help outside itself? Was man to depend, as it has been expressed, on "the results of his original creation," or to look beyond them to "the principle of Mediation"? The bishops enumerate some of the evasive interpretations put by Pelagianism on grace: it was natural freewill, or it was a moral law, or it was pardon of sin—or, they might have added, it was the example of Christ as the most impressive of moral object-lessons; it was anything but the one thing required: so that nature, *minus* true grace, was viewed as involving a capacity of entire virtue; or if "grace" were used for the moral law, that was a confusion between the power that gave commands and the power that assisted man to fulfil them. The acquittal obtained by Pelagius in Palestine must have been given on the supposition that he *did* acknowledge supernatural grace; and even supposing that he himself was in fact clear of certain charges brought against him, it would still be

well for Innocent to exhort him to remove a serious scandal by repudiating the misbelief laid to his charge. We are not, they said, concerned with Pelagius alone: perhaps he has been reclaimed—we hope it is so; but the question is whether a manifest error, or series of errors, should be allowed to go on misleading souls without any check from the Roman see. It would be clearly right to summon him to Rome, or else to question him by letter as to the sense which he attached to “grace.” The writers also send to Innocent the treatise ascribed to Pelagius, and Augustine’s treatise in answer “On Nature and Grace,” with important passages marked, and with a letter, now lost, which had been addressed to Pelagius by Augustine.

The drift of these letters is obvious: Africa is urging on Rome a line of action, is exhorting the Pope as to his duty, although in highly deferential terms. Perhaps Innocent discerned as much, and therefore thought it specially important, in his reply to the letter of the Council of Carthage, to enlarge on the dignity of Peter as “the source of the episcopate” (possibly meaning that the episcopal commission traced itself up to Christ’s words in Matt. xvi. 19), and to affirm that the fathers, by a divine sentence, had decreed that “all grave matters arising even in far-separate and distant provinces should be referred to the Roman see before they were brought to a final settlement.” The “fathers” had done nothing of the kind; but this sort of claim was by this time part of the established *modus loquendi* of a Roman bishop in replying to any consultative letters from other parts of Western Christendom, and scrupulosity as to evidence for statements of fact on such an occasion was not regarded at Rome as a duty. The applications in question would be construed as requests for a decisive pronouncement; and the Pope would not hesitate to make assertions which he could not substantiate, by way of forming a precedent for later demands; even as in the year preceding, Innocent had calmly told a bishop in Umbria that not only in Italy, but in Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the other adjacent islands, every existing Church had been founded from Rome. On the matters now in dispute, Innocent set forth emphatically the truth of man’s continuous dependence upon God, and the need not only of baptismal cleansing, but afterwards of grace as a remedy for subsequent falls: he referred in illustration to the prayers daily offered in church; and declared that the teachers of a pestilent heresy ought to have no further standing

as Churchmen, but, if they would renounce their error, might be treated as *lapsi* who were penitent. To the bishops who had met at Milevum he wrote in similar terms: "Whenever a question of faith is raised, I think that all our fellow-bishops ought, as Your Affectionatenesses have done, to refer only to Peter, that is, to the founder of their name and dignity"—language which he would hardly have used in writing to Easterns; and then, after censuring the Pelagian denial of true grace as distinct from native freewill, and citing the text "Suffer little children"—and also that about "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man" in illustration of the then prevalent custom of administering Communion to infants, which of course presupposed their baptism—Innocent declares that the Pelagian leaders ought to be excluded from pastorship, and even from the churches, yet not refused readmission on recanting their errors and asking for the peace of the Church. To the five bishops he also wrote that he could not express any opinion on the judgment of the Council of Palestine, because he could not feel sure that its alleged minutes were genuine: they had not been authenticated by any of its members. He had read the book said to be by Pelagius, which his correspondents had forwarded to him, and "found in it nothing that pleased him, hardly anything that did not seriously displease him; it should be condemned and trampled underfoot." All these letters are dated the 27th of January, 417. Shortly afterwards, Augustine received the "gesta" or minutes of the Council of Palestine, and thereupon wrote his "*De Gestis Palæstinis*," or, as now usually called, "*De Gestis Pelagii*," to prove the unfairness of Pelagius's own account of its proceedings.

On the 12th of March of the same year Innocent died: and if he is to be numbered among those ancient Roman prelates who have aggrandised their see by claims inadequately supported by fact, and have thus prepared the ground for later usurpations tending to the modern papal autocracy, he yet deserves respect for his manful championship of persecuted holiness in the case of Chrysostom, and his energetic defence of the doctrines of grace and redemption when virtually impugned by Pelagius. The successor of Innocent was a Greek named Zosimus. To him, as to one less likely to sympathize with the keen anti-Pelagian sensitiveness of Western, or at least African, bishops, Cœlestius personally appealed, after having been driven away from Constantinople by the "zeal" of Atticus, who wrote against him to

the bishops of Asia, Thessalonica, and Carthage. He hastened, we are told, to Rome. Zosimus gave him a hearing, and was informed that he had been falsely accused by Paulinus and wrongly condemned by the Council of Carthage. In prosecution of this appeal, Cœlestius presented a document, in which he dwelt with needless minuteness on points not in question, and then, advertng to the matters at issue, pleaded that he had but stated his own private inferences from Scripture, and now submitted them to "apostolical" judgment. What he said about grace, we know not; but as to original sin, he denied it wholly. "Infants ought, I confess, to be baptized for remission of sins; for the Lord has declared that the baptized alone can inherit the kingdom of heaven." This was to come nearer to the Catholic position than during his trial at Carthage. "But I do not mean by this statement to affirm the transmission of sin, which is very alien from Catholic sentiment." This, on the other hand, was to deny, as false, what at Carthage he had only treated as disputable. "Sin is the fault of will, not of nature; and I have been obliged to guard by this distinction against any inference drawn from the Sacrament in derogation to the goodness of the Creator." If he meant to deny the transmission of sinfulness, this was to accept the words of the Church and to withhold from them their meaning, and no man who believed such a transmission would have been content to trace each sin to a personal act of the will and to stop there without mentioning an antecedent evil propensity.

Zosimus was, at the time, too much occupied to go into the case; but he appointed the formal inquiry to take place, not in his Lateran abode, but in the neighbouring basilica of St. Clement, "in order that the authority of so great a bishop might have its due effect in the settlement of the case." Cœlestius was called before the assembly, which met in what is now the "lower" or subterranean church of St. Clement, erected in the fourth century, and referred to by Jerome "as preserving to this day the memory" of the great sub-apostolic bishop. Its columns still support the floor of the upper church, which was erected in the eleventh century and is of extraordinary interest as preserving the old basilican features in perfection; from this the visitor descends to the scene of the court of inquiry. Paulinus was at Carthage; so that, like Pelagius at the Diospolitan Council, Cœlestius had an advantage. His paper or "libellus" was read; and full weight was

given to his profession of readiness to be set right if proved to be wrong. Then Zosimus asked whether his mind was really in accordance with his written sentiments—which was, in effect, to accept the “libellus” as orthodox, and with it the denial of the “transmission of sin.” Cœlestius answered in the affirmative; and being next asked whether he condemned the errors published under his name, he replied that he condemned them *as* they had been condemned by Innocent. “Do you condemn what Paulinus laid to your charge at Carthage?” “Paulinus,” replied Cœlestius, “might be proved to be a heretic.” Zosimus became impatient at this evasion: “Don’t shuffle with us” (literally, “I will not have you *lead us about*”); “answer, do you condemn all that has been imputed to you by Paulinus or by common report?” We are told that a plain affirmation could not be drawn from him; and when questioned as to the other accusers, Heros and Lazarus, he replied that he had never really known them, had but casually seen Lazarus, and had received an apology from Heros for thinking ill of him without proof. Zosimus resolved to adjourn the case until he could learn more from Africa; but admonished Cœlestius and the bishops present to “avoid minute and useless inquiries which grew out of mere curiosity, and were in their effect the reverse of edifying.” The assembly declared Heros and Lazarus, in their absence, to have forfeited episcopal dignity and Church communion; and then Zosimus set himself to write to the bishops of Africa. Beginning as usual with high words about his see, as the appointed source of sound teaching for the whole world (a position which it had not discharged in the Arian controversy), he described the recent hearing, adding that when the Africans had Cœlestius before them, they had not come to “any clear decision;” spoke severely of Heros and Lazarus; quoted the story of Susanna and the judgment of Solomon as illustrating the necessity of careful examination of any charge brought against a brother; moralised on “slowness to believe evil as the sign of an excellent disposition,” and then came at last to the point. Observe, he had not pressed Cœlestius to explain or defend the denial of inherited “sin;” on the contrary, he had recognised the paper which contained it as satisfactory in itself; and now he tells the Africans that Cœlestius’s belief had been proved to be “perfectly sound” (*absoluta fide*): if any wished to impugn it, let them come to Rome within two months; or else, let the African bishops give up all “doubts” on the subject, in view of the “plain

and manifest" proofs which Cœlestius's language had supplied for his own vindication.

After thus writing on the case of Cœlestius, he received from Praylius, the new bishop of Jerusalem, an earnest appeal in behalf of Pelagius, who had sent a letter and a confession of faith, intended to be read by Innocent, but naturally delivered to his successor. Fragments of the letter are preserved by Augustine. Pelagius represented himself as having incurred blame on account of his alleged disapproval of the baptism of infants, which was held to imply the promise of the kingdom of heaven to the unredeemed. This looked like an attempt, as Augustine puts it, to throw dust into the reader's eyes. The points at issue were misrepresented: Pelagius might easily profess scornful indignation at any one who could even admit such an idea; "but," says Augustine, "he will not clear himself in that fashion." As to grace, Pelagius asserted freewill in all men, adding that it was "bare and helpless in non-Christians, in Christians alone was aided by grace," or "by the help of Christ;" and non-Christians would be condemned for not using their freewill so as to come to faith and obtain God's grace,"—"which," says Augustine, "implies that grace is given according to merits," *i.e.* as a reward for good acts done without it. Like Cœlestius, he was diffuse in his dogmatic statement, or "*libellus fidei*," on points irrelevant to the matter in hand: his exposition of doctrine as to the Trinity and the Incarnation is valuable for luminous orthodoxy, might remind us of terms in the "*Quicumque*," and anticipates, by its confession of "two perfect substances in the one person of Christ," the exact definitions of Chalcedon; but on the crucial points he was vague and reserved. Baptism was to be administered in the same form to infants and to adults; God's commands were not beyond man's fulfilment; Jovinian was wrong in asserting human impeccability, Manicheans in saying that men could not but sin; all men had freedom of will, yet all men always needed the "help" of God. "As to which," says Augustine, "one has again to ask, What sort of help? and he might reply that he means the moral law, or Christian doctrine, considered as auxiliary to natural power." One statement, condemning those who say that Christ as man was not sinless, was levelled at a quotation which Jerome had made from "the Gospel according to the Hebrews." Pelagius concluded by a deferential request to be set right, if he erred, by the Pope, as one who "held the faith and the see of Peter." These papers

were read in a public ecclesiastical assembly with the same forms as were observed in the case of Cœlestius. It may be admitted that on this occasion it was more natural for the judges to be, in Tillemont's phrase, "surprised," than during the oral examination of Cœlestius; and so we are assured that "the holy men who were present all but wept" with admiring sympathy; and Zosimus, on the 21st of September, wrote another letter to the African bishops, reproving them for credulous and uncharitable haste to admit the cavils of unprincipled accusers against two men ascertained to be "perfectly satisfactory in belief" (*absolutæ fidei*). Pelagius's paper, writes the Pope, "had most abundantly" cleared him of all suspicion; and after a vehement paragraph against Heros and Lazarus, he admonished the African bishops not to condemn before they had examined—not to welcome every wind that blew their way as if it carried truth along with it. Rather let them imitate the scrupulous and patient caution of civil tribunals in criminal cases, with respect both to the choice of judges and to adjournments with a view to further evidence; yes, and let them also remember how "the Saviour Himself, the Sacrifice and High Priest of the whole world," had been done to death by calumny: and if the return of the son in the parable was a cause of joy, much more should they rejoice over Pelagius and Cœlestius as brethren proved not to have been dead or lost, to have never been separate from the Christian body or from the Catholic truth.

Now, this language cannot be glossed as referring merely to the offer of the two accused persons to be corrected by Rome. It repeatedly ascribes "soundness of faith" to the doctrinal statements made by both in reply to accusation, and therein, inevitably, to the negation of transmitted "sin" by the one, to the vague and suspicious definition of divine "help" on the part of the other. Such was the solemn judgment pronounced by a bishop of Rome in favour of the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Cœlestius—or, in his own phrase, the "good confession" of one, the "abundant self-vindication" of the other; the *fides absoluta* of both, the right of both to be regarded as having "never lost" their hold on truth. What are we to say of him who gave this award, which was promptly annulled by the sentiment of the whole Church? That Zosimus, though himself no Pelagian, allowed himself, with culpable facility, to be imposed on by men far cleverer than himself, and with a most unlucky impetuosity committed himself

to their acquittal. If there be one case in Augustine's writings where he suppresses or glides over a disagreeable or discreditable fact, it is in the case of this Pope, for whom he afterwards made excuses which, it has been truly said, "go beyond the words of Zosimus," drawing the veil of a studied indistinctness over the reality and gravity of the error, as if he had merely endeavoured by "gentleness" to bring Cœlestius round, and had not in fact guaranteed his freedom from heresy. We see here, unquestionably, his respect and tenderness for Rome. She had faltered, but she had righted herself; it was desirable to make the most of her righting and the least of her faltering, so as to secure her full strength on the side which she had finally espoused.

The African bishops, having received Zosimus's first letter in behalf of Cœlestius, met in Council, and wrote to him desiring that the case might stand over until he was more fully informed as to its merits; and then, when their numbers had increased to 214, passed certain doctrinal resolutions on the points raised, and concluded by a virtual appeal from the authority of a living pope to that of his dead predecessor. "We determine that the sentence pronounced from the see of the most blessed apostle Peter, by the venerable bishop Innocent, against Pelagius and Cœlestius, shall hold good until by a perfectly explicit confession they acknowledge that God's grace aids us, through Jesus Christ, not only to know but to do our duty, in regard to every single act; so that without it we cannot have, think, speak, or do, anything that belongs to true and holy piety." One cannot but admire the diplomatic ingenuity of this resolution: it saves all respect for the dignity of the First See, while it practically sets aside the ill-considered action of its present occupant; the principle of an appeal from the present to the past is adopted and carried out; a dead pope's authority is utilised for a veiled rebuke to the living pope, intimating that he has lost his way by striking out a path for himself. And the Council wrote to him in terms so earnest that he calls their letter an "obtestation." They urged him to adhere to Innocent's judgment as to the small value of Pelagius's acquittal, and respectfully but plainly intimated their opinion that it was not they but Zosimus who had exhibited a hasty credulity; that he, in fact, had taken too much on trust from Cœlestius, and had omitted the duty of strictly examining his words. Cœlestius, they insisted, must not get off by a general profession of adhesion to Innocent's teaching; he must be required

to condemn explicitly the errors contained in his own statement, lest the alleged approval of Zosimus should outweigh the known censure of Innocent. They sent an account of all former proceedings in copies of authentic records, and entrusted their documents to a Carthaginian subdeacon named Marcellinus, who also took charge of a written reply by Paulinus to a missive from Zosimus summoning him to Rome. This summons had arrived on November 2nd, and the answer was written on November 8th. In it Paulinus strives to represent Zosimus as having already, in effect, condemned Cœlestius by calling on him to disavow what Paulinus had imputed to him. "The Roman Church," he says, "knows well enough whom she holds guilty." He claims many "ancient Catholic doctors" of east, west, north, and south, as attesting the doctrine of original sin; but the only Eastern father whom he cites is Gregory of Nazianzus.

Zosimus might derive some momentary satisfaction from this complimentary version of his conduct; but on reflection he became conscious that he had taken a dangerous step, and had brought the Roman Church itself into a difficulty. What was to be done? His only course was to grant the delay asked for by the Africans with as little as possible of self-humiliation, and as much as possible of self-assertion. Accordingly he wrote a letter—reckoned as his tenth—which is unique in its combination of magniloquent claims with a practically complete surrender: like our James I. on embarrassing occasions, he retreats, but blusters while retreating. In September, having been deceived by the unprincipled Patroclus, bishop of Arles, he had written that even his own see could not deprive Arles of its metropolitanical dignity: but in this case he makes an unqualified claim, asserting, after the current papal fashion, much more than he could have proved if challenged to prove it—as that "the fathers have ascribed to the apostolic see so great an authority that none should dare to question its judgment;" but intimates that, although no one could call him to account, yet out of brotherly feeling he wishes to act with the Africans; and lastly, descending as it were step by step, he acknowledges the necessity of full deliberation, and assures them that he has taken no final resolution, and that they are mistaken if they suppose him to have given entire credence, "in every syllable as it were," to the statements of Cœlestius. This, after he had declared Cœlestius to be "perfectly sound in faith," and never to have swerved from the truth, and had lectured the

Africans on their over-hasty assumption of his unsoundness! "We have made no change since we received your letter; everything is left in the state in which it was when we formerly wrote to your Holinesses,"—that is, in approval of Cœlestius!

This letter was dated on March 21st, 418. The chronological sequence of the next events is uncertain. We know, indeed, that Honorius, on April 30th, issued a letter to "Palladius, prætorian prefect," in which the Pelagian errors were traced to "fallacious knowledge" and denounced in that style of turgid rhetoric which had become official in government departments. The charge of libelling the divine justice was ingeniously retorted on the Pelagians, who held that God had created man subject to death irrespectively of sin, so that abstinence from sin would not have availed to avert the doom. They also held that the first man's transgression affected himself only, whereas the "Catholic law" or religion clearly testified that he thereby became the "vestibule of destruction" for all his descendants. Reference was made to the existence of a Pelagianizing clique in the "most sacred city" of Rome itself; and the two leaders of the party, with their Roman adherents when duly informed against before a tribunal, were sentenced to perpetual exile. We know not what influence produced this vigorous imperial intervention; some have supposed it to be prior, and others subsequent, to the celebrated circular in which Zosimus, addressing himself to the bishops of Constantinople, Thessalonica, Jerusalem, and Egypt, but more particularly to those of Africa, pronounced an explicit condemnation of the very men whom he had as formally pronounced to be injuriously suspected and to have fully proved their complete orthodoxy. On the whole, it would appear that this step was taken before the appearance of Honorius's rescript; for otherwise Zosimus could not have resolved, as we find he did, to re-examine Cœlestius. Cœlestius, with Pelagius, would have been already under command to leave Rome; whereas we are told that he declined to reappear before Zosimus and left the city of his own accord. The Pope's letter—which must have been written for him by some one better informed than himself—set forth, by quotations from Pelagius's commentary on St. Paul, the errors charged against Cœlestius: it went so far as to condemn the theory of a place of salvation, outside the Kingdom of Heaven, for the unbaptized; and insisted on the doctrine of inherited sinfulness, and on baptism as its remedy, in words worthy to be had in remembrance—"Faithful

is the Lord in His own words; and His baptism, in fact and in terms, that is, in its operative declaration, and real remission of sins, has the same fulness in each sex, age, and condition of mankind. No one is made free from sin save him who has been the slave of sin; no one can be said to be redeemed who has not really been the captive of sin before his redemption. . . . By the death of Christ is annulled that handwriting of death transmitted through Adam to all of us by means of natural birth, and by which every single person born is held bound, before he is set free by means of baptism." On the subject of real assisting grace he was equally explicit. "What time is there," he asked, in a passage afterwards quoted by Pope Celestine, "in which we are not in need of help? Therefore in all actions, causes, thoughts, movements, we must pray to our Helper and Protector; for human nature to claim aught for itself is mere pride." Zosimus also took care (having learned something from the reception of his letter in Africa) to speak respectfully, and in a brother-like tone, of his colleagues' episcopal rights. "Under the prompting of God—for to Him all good things are to be referred as to their author—we have brought the whole case before the minds of our brethren and fellow-bishops."

This circular was called a *Tractoria*—a term properly belonging to a letter of citation, but here used with a transference of meaning. The general result will be best considered after we have observed the next incident in the African drama. Those who date the *Tractoria* after Honorius's edict will place it after the holding of the great African Council—a Council of all (Western) Africa—which met at Carthage on May 1st, the very next day after the imperial signature had been attached to that edict. If we accept the view which makes the *Tractoria* precede the edict, it of course precedes the Council also, and in that case it is the more remarkable that the acts of that assembly make no reference to any doctrinal utterances from Rome, whether by Innocent or by Zosimus. A series of doctrinal canons was passed, in the form which had long been unfortunately prevalent, that is, with an anathema against the maintenance of the theories therein condemned.

1. Anathema to those who say that man was created mortal, and would have died even though he had not fallen.

2. The second canon has a central importance in the series. In order to understand it, we must remember that "baptism" was universally regarded as "for the remission of sins." A baptism

not "for the remission of sins" was inconceivable. That object must, it was held, be real if baptism was to have any significance, so that the Pelagians were hard put to it to account for baptism as administered to those who as yet were incapable of actual sin. If in an infant there was nothing which needed "remission," why baptize him at all? It never occurred to them to say, "In order to admit him into a covenant." Sometimes they would adopt the gloss that remission of future sins was guaranteed—a view resembling that which makes baptism a pledge and not an instrument; sometimes they desperately assumed the possibility of actual sins on the part of infants. Of these two expedients, the latter was felt to be a defiance of fact; and the former explained away the obvious sense of the phrase in question, which referred to a remission granted in and through the administration of the sacrament, belonging, as we should say, to its "inward grace." Now let us look at the Carthaginian canon or proposition, which anathematizes those who deny that infants ought to be baptized, or say that they are indeed baptized "for remission of sins," but that they derive no original sin from Adam: "from which it follows that in their case the form of baptism for remission of sins" (*i.e.* the profession as to the effect of baptism) "is not true but false. For St. Paul's words, 'Through one man sin entered,' etc., are to be understood no otherwise than as the Catholic Church everywhere spread abroad has always understood them: for in view of the rule of faith, even infants, though not as yet able to commit personal sin, are truly baptized unto remission of sins, for this intent—that in them that may be washed away through regeneration which they derived by natural birth." In other words, original sin meant a taint or stain which required baptismal cleansing.

3. Passing over, as perhaps not genuine (for Celestine I. in his Articles does not reckon it as belonging to this Council), a decree condemning those who maintain that there is a place of blessedness for infants who die unchristened, we find that the next decree condemns the opinion that grace avails only for pardon of sins past, not for aid against sin in the future. This points to that Pelagian gloss which defined grace as remission of past sins.

4. Against those who admit that grace is indeed an effectual aid against future sin, but understand the aid it gives to consist merely in "enabling us to know our duty, not in enabling us to

love and do it"—the view, in short, which reduced grace to instruction.

5. Against those who say that grace has indeed some effect in regard to our doing what is right, but is only given to make that easier which without it would still be possible; "for our Lord said, Without Me ye can do nothing."

The three remaining canons condemn those who reduce the words, "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves," to an expression of humility, or who interpret "Forgive us our trespasses," when said by holy persons, either in a similar sense, or as an intercession for others. They illustrate the tendency of Pelagianism to self-righteousness, and also to an unreal use of sacred words; and we observe a link between such non-recognition of sinfulness—of the need of actual forgiveness—and the language ascribed to some of the "Plymouth Brethren," to the effect that the justified are "worshippers once for all purged."

These doctrinal canons are put forth on the sole authority of the African episcopate. Arrangements were added, providing for the case where a Catholic church and a Donatist (but now also Catholic) church in the same district had depended on different sees, and adjusting the several bishops' claims to this or that place won over from schism: and it was enacted that clerics complaining of their bishops' judgments must appeal with consent of such bishops to "neighbouring (*vicini*) bishops, and from them, if they wish, to African Councils, or to the primates of their own provinces" (*i.e.* their metropolitans), and that any one appealing to a "transmarine" authority—that is, it would be understood, to Rome—would forfeit communion with the African Church. This canon is in two forms, the 28th and 125th sections of the African Church code. In one form of this canon, instead of "African Councils," we read "a universal Council," which does not mean an (Ecumenical synod, but a general assembly of all the "African bishops;" and there is added an important clause, "Even as has often been ordained about bishops also:" words which probably represent a remark by the presiding primate Aurelius when proposing the canon to the Council of 418, and which are covered by a passage in St. Cyprian's fifty-ninth letter, to the effect that "it has been ordained by us all that each man's cause should be heard where the offence charged against him was committed."

The Tractoria of Zosimus was accepted, Mercator tells us, by the

bishops of Christendom generally and confirmed by their signatures ; but if we ask whether the prelates regarded it as intrinsically decisive—as, in modern phrase, an infallible, irreversible, *ex cathedra* judgment—we may find an answer in Augustine's words to certain Pelagians. In one well-known passage (or rather, a passage best known by a daring Roman perversion of its import) he had said that "two Councils had sent their resolutions to the apostolic see, and that replies had been returned, so that *causa finita est* ;" but this was a premature utterance in a sermon preached at Carthage before the arrival of Zosimus's letter about Pelagius, which must have soon convinced Augustine that the matter was *not* settled, that "the apostolic see" could give an unsatisfactory pronouncement. Four years later, he reproduces the same phrase in a different connexion : "Your cause (the Pelagians') has now been concluded by a competent judgment of *bishops acting in common* ;" even as, when writing in 420 to the successor of Zosimus, he had spoken of the "pastoral care" of the Christian flock as "common to all bishops," although among them the bishop of Rome was pre-eminent. The African bishops wrote a letter of acknowledgment to Zosimus, an extant fragment of which shows that they made use of a sentence already quoted from the Tractoria to illustrate the co-existence and harmony of divine inspirations with human free-will and cleverly utilised the issue of the Tractoria as an eminent instance of such freewill on the Pope's part. Their primate was informed of Honorius's edict by an imperial letter dated June 11, in which "Our Clemency" is said to have followed their judgment, *i.e.* their action in Pope Innocent's time ; and a duplicate of this letter was sent to Augustine himself.

Augustine, who had been detained at Carthage, after the dissolution of the Council of May 1, to act with other prelates on a committee for the settlement of some outstanding business, received, before he left, a letter from three persons then in Palestine—Pinianus, Albina, and Melania—who had recently seen and conversed with Pelagius. They had urged him to repudiate the errors ascribed to him. He had then declared that he fully believed "grace" to be necessary, at every moment, for every good action ; and that infants received baptism for remission of sin. He read to them his profession of faith, which had been intended for Pope Innocent ; objected to his recent sentence, as including him with Coelestius in its condemnation ; and again referred to the decision of the Council of Diospolis in his favour. On being informed of

this, Augustine wrote a book "On the Grace of Christ," in order to show that Pelagius acknowledged "grace" in some inadequate senses, such as "forgiveness," or "Christ's example," or "teaching" in the fuller sense of an illumination of spiritual eyesight. He had not on any occasion frankly admitted real grace; and, while acknowledging the need of help for our "capacity" of choosing aright, he ignored it in regard to the "act" of so choosing. Then, in a second book, "On Original Sin," Augustine contrasted the outspokenness of Coelestius with the disingenuousness of Pelagius, urging that the latter had denied any vicious tendency in man prior to personal choice of evil, and that his admissions which had been accepted in Palestine had been, in fact, insincere. He had not *bona fide* separated himself from Coelestius; he had not really renounced the doctrine that Adam's fall had harmed Adam alone, and that infants were born in Adam's unfallen state. In this second book Augustine's intense conviction of the vital nature of the controversy (which Pelagius represented as not really touching the faith) comes forth in the words, "In the case of these two Men, the First and the Second Adam, the faith of Christ is, properly speaking, involved."

From Rome a layman resident there named Mercator—undoubtedly the same with the Marius Mercator whose writings on the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies are extant and important, and whose account of the origin of Pelagianism has been already cited—had written to Augustine while he was still at Carthage, and again after he left it, and had sent him two anti-Pelagian treatises, one "filled with Scriptural proofs:" Augustine replied in terms of warm commendation, and suggested answers to some questions which Mercator had proposed. Those Roman clerics who had been known or supposed to favour Pelagianism had submitted to the teaching of the Tractoria, and had thereby incurred from the Pelagians the charge of "*prævaricatio*," or betrayal of the cause which they had professed to advocate. Among these was Sixtus, a Roman priest whom the Pelagians of the city had "boasted of as an influential patron," while Catholic opinion had regarded him (it is Augustine who speaks) as "favouring the enemies of Christian grace;" he was now the first to pronounce anathema against them in a full congregation, and wrote in that sense to Aurelius of Carthage. The bearer of this "very brief letter" was an acolyte named Leo, apparently identical with the Leo who many years afterwards occupied the Roman see and deservedly

obtained the appellation of "the Great." Sixtus also wrote a longer letter—setting forth with greater fulness the belief entertained by Roman Churchmen on the question, and containing a "clear defence of the grace of God"—to Augustine personally, who read it, as he says, with exultation, proportionate to his previous regret on account of the writer's supposed inclinations to Pelagianism. Augustine replied at great length, in his memorable 194th Epistle. As we should expect, he condemned the forced senses put by Pelagianism upon grace; insisted that the originating principle of all good in man was a divine act moving him to good; described the good deeds of men as in fact gifts from God; and deduced "inherited sin" from the practice of infant baptism, rebuking the gloss which Pelagians sometimes put on the profession of baptismal faith in remission of sin made by sponsors on behalf of infants, as if it were an abstract profession as to the effect of baptism in other cases. Thus far the letter contained nothing particularly memorable. But it went further, and developed, by way of inference from certain passages of the Epistle to the Romans, a theory of absolute predestination irrespective of all conditions (such as the qualities or conduct of the predestinate), and grounded simply on the inscrutable decrees of God. The whole mass of Adam's children—so Augustine sternly and stringently determined—was a mass of lost and condemned beings. Out of this mass He, who could justly have condemned and punished all, elected some, as vessels of unmerited and inexplicable mercy. If any man asked a reason for this election, or, in particular, for the awful difference made between two infants, one elect and the other not elect, there was none to be given but that such was the Sovereign Will: "O the depth of the wisdom . . . how unsearchable are His judgments!" Or if he was tempted to make this absolute decree a matter of presumption for the favoured ones, or of excuse for the condemned, let him hear the question, "Who art thou that repliest against God?" and remember what insoluble problems are set before us daily by such facts as illustrate nothing so much as our incapacity to judge of His procedure.

This was an utterance of the Predestinarianism which, some twenty years before, had appeared in Augustine's letter to Simplicianus of Milan, and which, some ten years later, reappeared in his criticism of a modification of the Pelagian theory: and it also seems, if we take the letter to Sixtus in its natural import, that its doctrine amounts to a definition of grace as irresistible, and therefore, in

later technical phrase, indefectible; that, in short, it contains a manual of the peculiarity of Augustinian theology on this subject, and displays the tendency of his mind to confront a heresy on the question of human freedom and ability by an ultra-logical but partial estimate of Scriptural teaching on the Sovereignty of God. No wonder that, eight years later, it perplexed a number of thoughtful monks, and provoked a new controversy by the hard, keen, pitiless absolutism of its tone; even as Augustine's apparent indifference to primary conceptions of divine equity drew forth the complaint that he was a libeller of the all-just God. We may wonder that a "mind so rich and so affectionate" could have taken up a view which, in our modern experience, has seemed to make the God of Christians unlovable. But we must remember that his mind was always full of the divine dealings which had led up to his own conversion: in magnifying the divine supremacy, in emphasizing the mystery of the divine choice, he seemed to himself to be, as it were, giving thanks for a mercy transcending all thought and words. Yet, this being allowed, we must still deplore the line which he thus took, and say with Mozley that, in the language under consideration, he committed the grave error of erecting on "an imperfect basis," without seeing that it was imperfect, a structure which it could not support, a structure of absolute and thoroughgoing Predestinarianism. He seized on the Scriptural passages which suggest or assert *an* election or *a* predestination, accentuated them, drew inferences from them, and so built up a system, round, complete, uncompromising—but one-sided. It may seem strange that, in dwelling on Rom. viii. 29, 30, he forgot the relation of those words to a long context, which presupposes throughout a real action of the believer's will in response to "adopting" grace, and thus leads up to the assurance that such a person has God on his side, and that all things work together for his good; so that predestination and what is described as following it are introduced as a guarantee of divine support for loyal souls as such, and the forces which are called incapable of "separating us from the love of God which is in Christ" do not include the internal capacity of the will to refuse that love by obdurate rebellion. But with the great idea of divine sovereignty dominating and fascinating his mind, Augustine could not adjust the balance; and instead of summarising the indications given by Scripture, now on this side, and then on that side, of a mystery which peculiarly resisted the touch of systematic combination, he

exaggerated the results of one set of passages, and threw another into the shade because an ungracious heresy had misused it. So, too, we may remark the relentless logic of Augustine's mind in his repeated assumption that the fact of baptismal grace implied the perdition of unbaptized infants; in his refusal to recognise any real goodness outside the pale of Christian sacraments and fellowship; and, not less, in his frequent use of language which would represent the original taint, disease, warp, perversion, corruption—call it by what name one may—which no observer of human nature can ignore, as rather the actual imputation of the very sin of “man's first disobedience” than as a condition of moral loss, involving a grievous weakening of inclination towards good and a too powerful bias in the direction of evil—a deterioration, in short, both passive and active, both negative and positive. This latter view would satisfy all the just requirements of belief in a Fall; and to such a condition as it recognises there must needs attach unfitness for the Divine Presence: the human being, “bereft of original grace, and wounded also in nature,” might, in that sense, be designated “a child of wrath;” and such an account of the effects of the Fall would excel Augustine's absolutism in fidelity to the facts of the case as looked at from all sides, and in avoidance of such overstatements as were sure to provoke moral and reasonable reclamation, and hasten a reaction that would give advantage to the opposite form of error. Thus much it seems necessary to say on the peculiarities of Augustine's anti-Pelagian dogmas. Great as he was when insisting on man's need of a Redeemer and Restorer, he did not possess the perfect theological self-command which enabled “an Athanasius to retain his grasp of an argument by both handles; and so he sometimes launched his javelin beyond recall, was overmastered sometimes by his own powers of logic, perhaps of rhetoric”—one might say certainly of rhetoric, for the rhetorical element, as a survival of his early proficiency in that art, holds too large a place in his management of the controversy. He was, in turn, outstripped by Calvin, who, as Archdeacon Hardwick expresses it, “exaggerated some parts of Augustine's theory, and curtailed others;” plainly spoke of the non-elect as “predestined to eternal condemnation” by a “decree” which he admitted to be “terrible” (for that is the true import of his *horribile*); brought out with relentless emphasis what Augustinianism rather implied than expressed; and, which is a still more important difference, by his theory of sacraments as but pledges of grace, and

that only to the elect, excluded that belief in sacramental efficacy which had made predestinarianism in Augustine "so different a thing from what it was in Calvin" by combining it with a recognition of spiritual facts too real to be merely relative. Thus, over and above the Predestinarian question, it was necessary, as to grace, to uphold the doctrine of a real supernatural gift of power, or presence of the Holy Spirit, bestowed through Christ, in order to work on the will and affections, and thereby to develop good action and to form good habits; but it was going too far to represent the will as irresistibly determined by such grace. Again, as to the Fall, it was necessary to affirm a real deterioration entailed on the first man's descendants by his lapse; but it was going too far to formalise this idea into a literal imputation of his personal sin and a total corruption of human nature, and to represent the ordinary sacramental remedy for the ingrained mischief as so absolutely necessary that without it salvation would be impossible.

It has been said, in Mercator's words, that the bishops of Christendom generally accepted the Tractoria of Zosimus; but there were some eighteen exceptions, of whom the most conspicuous was Julian, bishop of Ecclanum or Eclanum in Campania, the son of an Apulian bishop named Memor and of his pious wife Juliana. This young prelate was a man of very remarkable ability: in boyhood, according to Bede, he had received some teaching from Pelagius; he had been made a Reader, had married, and, after his ordination as deacon in 408 or 409, had made a very favourable impression on Augustine himself, who spoke of him as his "son and fellow-deacon;" and he had afterwards been consecrated bishop by Innocent himself. He had not avowed his general agreement with Pelagius while Innocent lived, but now refused to sign, at his successor's bidding, a formulary condemning the opinions which, with some not unimportant modifications, he himself held. Impetuosity and pertinacity were inherent in his character; and his intense conviction that the anti-Pelagian campaign struck at the belief in human responsibility and divine justice was combined, according to Augustine, with a supercilious contempt for his opponents as an uncultured crowd swayed by crude pietistic prejudices, and with a disposition, such as had been observed in Cœlestius, to rely on a dialectical readiness and acuteness, rather than on Scriptural authority or ecclesiastical sentiment, for the controversial triumphs which he made sure to win.

When summoned to sign the Tractoria, he and the group of

bishops who agreed with him addressed to Zosimus a letter, and to the bishop of Aquileia a memorial or "*libellus fidei*," which, like that of Pelagius, begins by stating the truths of the Creed in terms elaborately orthodox, and especially affirms that "the Son of God, in becoming man, did not, as if by a change, cease to be God;" but which differs from Pelagius's formula by being more explicit, and much less unsatisfactory, on the points really in question. The memorialists acknowledge the "grace of Christ" as co-operating with freewill, condemn those who say that sin can be avoided without it, and call it the "perpetual helper and companion of all good acts;" while they maintain—rightly enough, we must say—that it will not "follow those who refuse it," and that, if one man is good and another bad, the difference is due to human fault and not to divine will. They admit that mankind did "die in Adam" (as St. Paul had expressly taught), and confess that baptism is necessary for persons of all ages, infants included, and is a prerequisite for the obtaining of pardon for all sins, and for admission into the Kingdom of Heaven, and should be administered to infants in exactly the same words as to adults. But they denounce the notion of "natural sin, or whatever else it is called," and quote Chrysostom as denying that infants brought to baptism are stained with "sins"—a perfectly irrelevant quotation, for of course Chrysostom was referring to the sins which we call actual or personal: but here we may see the result of Augustine's application of the word "sin" to a condition of inherited sinful tendency, for to obscure a clear distinction was to introduce confusion into the debate. In one passage of their letter they protest against being required to condemn Pelagius or Cœlestius in their absence. "Men who clear themselves by memorials, condemn false doctrines ascribed to them, profess to be Catholics, may well be defended and have their doubtful language favourably construed; but we," keeping to strict impartiality, "will neither condemn nor defend them. Your Holiness may rest assured that, however wildly just now the sea may rage against us, it will never be able to shake that house of right judgment which is founded on the righteousness of Christ." Both letter and memorial failed of their purpose. Zosimus replied to the former by excommunicating Julian, Florus, Orontius, Fabius, and other Pelagianizing prelates; whereupon Julian wrote, and his friends took care to circulate, a second letter to Zosimus, in which he again disclaimed all negation of the Scriptural propositions as to all men dying in Adam and

owing their share in resurrection to Christ, and treated another Pelagian statement "that infants are born in Adam's unfallen condition" as dubious, and another "that Adam was created mortal and would have died in any case" as devoid of warrant.

And so, without the slightest fear of what Church authorities would do to him, without the smallest self-mistrust in view of the vast majority arrayed against him, Julian, supported by the contributions of his adherents, entered on a course of sectarian activity which, in spite of all discouragements, was prolonged into the pontificate of Leo. The Pelagian bishops, under his guidance, appealed to Honorius, as early as the October of 418, for a new hearing before a General Council. This was a step which might give cause for uneasiness: we find Zosimus writing to some clerics of his whom he had sent to the Court of Ravenna, and warning them against certain excommunicated persons who had ventured to proceed to the court; in this letter he intimated that these persons had gained some adherents at Rome, whose case would be matter for grave deliberation when his deputies should return. But the Pelagian cause had a powerful adversary at the court in the person of Count Valerius. He defeated their attempt to obtain a new trial; his house, in Augustine's phrase, became "a place of comfort to the holy, and of terror to the impious." To him Augustine, who had been accused, in a treatise addressed by some Pelagian to Valerius, of implicitly condemning marriage as a medium of the "transmission of sin," sent in 419 a first book "On Marriage," which came into the hands of Julian, who forthwith replied in four books to what is described as one-fourth of Augustine's argument. Augustine received some extracts from this reply, which were sent to him by Valerius, and, without waiting to see the whole work, he wrote a second book "On Marriage" in 420. He uniformly recognised the "honourableness" of that state, although he regarded celibacy as intrinsically higher and in some part of his language gave occasion to notions not far removed from the Oriental assumption of an impurity in matter. It was after the publication of this second book that he received from Boniface I.—who succeeded Zosimus at the end of 418—through the medium of his friend, bishop Alypius, copies of a letter (said to be from Julian) addressed to some of the Roman clergy, in which their chiefs were branded as turncoats, and of another letter, addressed by the eighteen Pelagianizing bishops to Rufus, the bishop of Thessalonica, who held a sort of delegation from Rome in Eastern Illyricum.

In both these documents—the former of which Julian did not acknowledge as his own—Augustine found himself, not for the first time, charged with retaining the leaven of his old Manicheism. It was a telling point: “This doctrine of sin as in the nature which we inherit is only a disguised form of the pestilent Oriental notion of a nature originally evil, not the creation of the good God.” To these “Two Letters of Pelagians” Augustine replied in four books, addressed to Boniface. He takes pains to set forth the Catholic doctrine as opposed alike to Pelagianism and to Manicheism. He repels the charge of fatalism: “It is not we who call fate grace, but you, our antagonists, who call grace fate.” He goes over his usual topics, not without indications of an extreme estimate of the power of grace over the will; he admits that baptism leaves unre-moved an infirmity which requires laborious correction; he asks how the “Pelagians” can explain the justice of allowing men to derive death from their first parent, when they are in no real relation to his sin; he sets aside the “Pelagians’” profession of “zeal” for creation as good, for marriage as holy, for freewill as real, on the ground that these points are not in dispute; and discusses certain passages of Cyprian and Ambrose as available against Pelagianism. It is in this treatise that he minimises the extent of Zosimus’s error in his treatment of Cœlestius and Pelagius.

Julian’s fertility and volubility as a controversialist were illustrated by the increasing bulk of each of his treatises: his rejoinder to the second book “On Marriage” consisted of eight books; and Augustine, after finishing a long critique on Julian, consisting of six books, found himself obliged to begin yet another treatise, which he did not live to complete, which is therefore called his “Unfinished Work against Julian,” and to which we are indebted for our liveliest notions of what Julian really meant, of what he intrinsically was. Augustine’s indignation at his “loquacity, self-confidence, and youthful rashness” has somewhat of the asperity of a senior who sustains a shock from finding himself disrespectfully treated by a junior; Julian is to him a forward young man, of whom he has formerly thought well, but who clearly needs to be set down with a severe snubbing. But Julian was not to be so easily set down. He leaves Augustine far behind in the rush of polemical invective: he likens him to the false prophets who “sewed pillows to armholes,” charges him with a disingenuous use of logic, and denounces him as a “Numidian of shameless front,” as “hasty and foolish” in “answering” a treatise of which he had

only seen some extracts, as trading on the ignorance of an illiterate majority made up of soldiers and sailors, low mechanics, cooks, dissolute ex-monks, ignorant clerics—people who swallowed blindly what was told them, who were dominated by ecclesiastical dogmatism, or who welcomed a doctrine that abated moral responsibility. He declared that the forces thus arrayed were dependent on bribes, on ladies' bequests, on popular agitation, on the corrupt influence of state functionaries. The censures of such a crowd were, to him, of no more importance than the noise of the "wind sweeping over a crop of lupines;" he was content with the support of the thoughtful few: Athanasius had been one of a small minority; Augustine, and those whom he led, were in that respect like the Arians! What if the tide, for the present, were in their favour? What if the Roman Church itself were now patronising a fatalistic error? There was but one plain duty for him and his friends, to uphold at all hazards unpopular truth. And it is instructive to see what mainly roused his wrath against the Augustinian line of statement. He repeatedly speaks of his adversaries as affirming "*naturale peccatum*," and thus of impugning the goodness of the Creator; and if this was a misrepresentation—akin to, or identical with, the Pelagianizers' habit of calling Augustine a Manichean—it cannot be denied that Augustine's persistent use of the word "sin" for the inherited moral taint or warp, together with some of his language on the relations between the sexes, gives some colour to the imputation. Julian had stronger ground to stand upon when he denounced the notion that unconscious infants would be absolutely condemned for the sin of the first father; this, he said, was an outrage against the supreme equity, and he bade Augustine "take himself off with that unjust God of his;" it made the Creator of men resemble a devil; it was a hideous, monstrous, infernal idea, "an indescribable sacrilege worse than any idolatry." He also denounced the unreal admission of freewill which was involved in the theory of irresistible grace, and meant a wrong to the divine justice. "Under the pretext of setting up grace, you have upset justice." A freedom which was, when examined, a determined or necessitated choice of right as against wrong, was not freedom at all and had no moral value as such. One of the unhappiest results of the discussion was that Julian fancied himself obliged, for the sake of the benefit of Christ's example, to suggest that He was in his Manhood susceptible of evil impulses—*i.e.* to reproduce one of the most offensive

points in the Christology of Theodore. But even here, as throughout, it was largely an ethical interest which dominated Julian. If only Augustine had been more careful to observe balance and proportion, and to provide scope in his system for diverse aspects of truth, Julian might have avoided a fatal stumbling-block; he might have been kept from committing himself on the side of heresy; he might even, perhaps, have been won over. As it was, he became the unwearied champion of a cause that lost strength and hope with every year. It is impossible not to admire his dauntless persistent energy, and to wish that it had been secured on the side of the Church. He looked at the mass of authority, influence, theological argument, that was arrayed against him, without quailing or even hesitating; if one resource failed, he was ready with another: when it became hopeless to obtain a hearing from the Western Emperor, he tried to gain it from the Church of Constantinople; and after traversing land and sea in the desperate enterprise to which he had devoted himself, he found shelter for a time in Cilicia, until Theodore, though agreeing with him in hostility to the Augustinian doctrine, was forced to anathematize him in a Council about the year 423. It was in the next year that Cœlestius, who had already been expelled from Rome, in 421, by an order of the co-Emperor Constantius, was driven out of Italy by the exertions of Celestine, then lately elected Pope, who accepted the anti-Pelagian view on the authority, it would seem, of the great African bishop whom, as he afterwards said, "his predecessors had regarded as one of the chief teachers of the Church, and whom he knew to have been loved and honoured by all."

The condemnation of Pelagianism, pronounced by the Western episcopate with various degrees of emphasis, under the guidance, technically of Rome, but really of Africa, was affirmed by the episcopate of the East. Pelagius disappears from history. Cœlestius, with characteristic pertinacity, continued his efforts to maintain something like a party. But, on the whole, the heresy was put under ban: it received a blow which paralyzed it. Yet its story is of imperishable interest: the importance of the question will be best seen by supposing all references to "grace" to be struck out of our own Church collects; and we shall learn to estimate the service which Augustine rendered to Christianity by observing how the Eastern habit of mind, which dwelt mainly on its illuminative side, on the "knowledge of truth" which, as "light," it imparted, needed to be balanced and supplemented by an opportune

insistence on grace, as "God's love in action" on the soul. Nor can we pass over the remarkable and most instructive fact, that Pelagianism, for all its ascetic affinities and its assertion of the possibility of a "sinless" righteousness in this world, did practically, to use Mozley's words, "dull the sense of sin, and depress the standard of virtue;" so that, when unconnected with the ennobling conception of grace, morality itself sunk down to a secular level. It was a befitting nemesis on "the self-sufficient will" which imagined that it could dispense with that "inspiration" which represents God's interest in man's truest life, and lifts goodness higher while keeping it humble. And so, "with all the excess to which Augustine pushed the truth which he defended, he was defending a vital truth, without which Christianity must have sunk to an inferior religion." Nor are we of this age without warnings of such a deterioration as a peril to be guarded against; for, as we have already observed, a mode of thought which reproduces the Pelagian principle is by no means without influence in the England of to-day. A revulsion from Calvinism may have had something to do with this practical revival of the old misbelief; but it might have occurred if Calvin had never written. Modern Pelagianism, so to call it, includes such elements as these: (1) A defective sense of the malignity of sin, growing out of a practical attenuation of the fact of moral corruption in human nature, and even positively substituting for the idea of sin that of a necessary "incident" in moral evolution. (2) A corresponding distinct negation of the need of restorative and invigorating "grace"—that is, of a present holy Will, not only pleading with our wills from without, but enclosing and stirring them up from within. (3) An inadequate estimate of the divine Sanctity and of its claim on human consciences, so that the idea of holiness is blurred and contracted, and the Christian conception of virtue is impoverished, or even put on the shelf as representing a one-sided and impracticable standard. (4) While Christianity is regarded chiefly as educational, rather than re-creative, so Christ's Person is viewed as simply beneficial to us by way of example: His office as a new Head of humanity, as a Fountain of spiritual life, is thrown into the background; and thus the disposition to lay the whole stress on a "Christian tone or temper," to be formed by worthy ideas of God, is found, in effect, to make for (so-called) Unitarianism. (5) A tendency to diminish as far as possible the scope of mystery in religion, and in particular to regard the Atonement simply as an appeal of divine love to

human gratitude, and as thus possessing a merely "subjective" efficacy; and consistently, (6) as Christ loses the glory of a Restorer and Life-giver, and His religion is denuded of its supernatural fulness, so the ordinances which, in the Catholic conception, are organs of His grace and "points of contact" with Himself, shrink into edifying badges of fellowship or occasions of devotion and resolution; and the Gospel of the Incarnation as a whole is submitted to a process which gradually takes the vital heat out of it, and reduces it to a "different Gospel," which in truth is no Gospel at all.

And yet the effects of over-statement, such as we have seen on Augustine's part, were presently only too manifest. Men who were not Pelagians began to ask whether the doctrine of inherited corruption and of inward restorative grace did in truth involve a rigid predestinarianism and a virtual suppression of freewill in those on whom grace was supposed to work: whether, in short, Augustine's controversial zeal was not carrying him considerably too far, and compromising some very important moral interests. We must place ourselves in thought at the important town of Hadrumetum, on the south-east coast of Proconsular Africa, some eighty miles from Carthage. In Archbishop Benson's words, "it came direct from Tyre—an older settlement than Carthage—and now" (*i.e.* when St. Cyprian visited it in 251) "was second city of the Province." In Augustine's time it had an important monastery under the rule of an abbot named Valentinus. In 426 or 427 one of the monks, named Florus, visiting his native town Uzala with a brother monk named Felix, found and copied Augustine's letter to Sixtus. He then went on to Carthage; and Felix, with whom he left the copy, returned to Hadrumetum, and began to read the letter to some of his brethren without the knowledge of Valentinus. Five of the members were scandalized. "It denies freewill and thereby annihilates responsibility!" When Florus came back, he was attacked as the cause of this trouble: he then told the case to Valentinus, who himself thoroughly agreed with the letter, and endeavoured to remove objections by the authority of bishop Evodius of Uzala, and also of a priest named Sabinus; but in vain. Thereupon, two of the perplexed monks, a second Felix and Cresconius, visited Augustine in the early part of 427, and heard from him much that might tend to elucidate the question of grace, together with something, no doubt, which exhibited grace in the light of an all-controlling energy. He also

wrote a letter for Valentinus and his monks ; and having induced his visitors to stay with him over Easter, he composed, for the further solution of the question, a new treatise "On Grace and Freewill," in which he verbally admitted a freedom of will, but also distinctly treated grace as *making* men will what was good, in such a way that "freedom" of will was used not in its natural sense, but in a sense esoteric and, in effect, unreal. For instance : "It is certain," says Augustine, "that we will when we do will," *i.e.* it is a real exercise of will on our part : "but," he adds, "God makes us to will ;" and so further on, "He makes us to do." Of course, he was here employing St. Paul's language to the effect that "it is God that works" (or "operates") "in us, both the willing and the doing" (Phil. ii. 13). But the verb "make" admits of several senses : and it was quite arbitrary to force upon it the most stringent sense possible, so as to suppose that it left the will no option, while at the same time the phrase "freewill" was practically explained away, and responsibility thereby nullified. It is a signal instance of Augustine's supremacy in the later theological schools that "efficax" was accepted as meaning irresistible ; so that the Jesuits, who held that "sufficient" grace was offered to all men, deemed it politic, in the Jansenist controversy, to allow the Dominicans to go on repeating their "Thomist" formula about the need of a further grace which "determined the will ;" and the Jansenists, even while admitting that grace was in the abstract resistible, contended that in fact it *made* the soul, being elect, willing to accept it, so that the irresistibility which had been disclaimed was brought back under a different wording. The treatise before us, when read at Hadrumetum, called forth, as well it might, from some of the monks, the objection, "This too leaves no room for true freedom and responsibility. On this showing, it may be very well to warn us about our duty, but it is quite unfair to censure us if we fail to fulfil it. For by the hypothesis, if we do thus fail, it is because God has withheld from us the power of fulfilling." Augustine, hearing of this criticism from Florus and some other monks, who at his request had come to Hippo, composed a supplementary tract "On Censure and Grace," which professed to answer the question, "Why am I to be censured if I do wrong, seeing I have not, on your showing, had grace given me to do right ?" The answer given could hardly be satisfactory to minds which really felt the difficulty ; for it insisted with extreme emphasis on the absoluteness and fixedness of

predestination, the purely irresistible power of grace, the distinction between such freewill as Adam had before his fall—that is, a freewill which needed only a certain degree of divine help—and a will “set free” by grace, that is, effectively determined towards goodness and endowed with the gift of perseverance. Such a freedom was described as “necessary” for human nature under existing temptations; and Augustine does not hesitate to call it a “greater freedom” than the former. He relied, we see, on the case of the angels as immutably fixed in goodness; but he forgot that there could be no parallel between their condition and that of souls still under probation. With an astonishing frankness in defying objections, he acknowledged that censure, pronounced on those who were not predestinate, was purely infictive: it could not mean that such persons might have done better, because in fact God had not been pleased to cure their depravity of will. He asserts, indeed, that a man’s badness comes of his own fault; he says that such a man ought to pray for himself: but, on his hypothesis, prayer on the part of a non-elect person is of no avail. He does not shrink from glossing the text, “God willeth all men to be saved,” as referring solely to the predestinate, *because* every class of men was represented in their number! In this treatise is contained a distinction between such grace or help as did not determine the will towards good, and such as did so determine it: the former did not, the latter did, carry with it the grant of perseverance, as to which we shall find him somewhat later expressing his mind at greater length. The attempt thus made to crush a moral difficulty by mere appeal to mystery was bound to fail; for we cannot believe in a justice which punishes those to whom it has given no opportunity. Nor is this a case which can be disposed of by reference to the imperfection of our knowledge: for if God condemns those to whom He has denied the means of obeying Him, this is a procedure which, by the hypothesis, is laid open to us in its entirety; and, as such, we cannot believe it to be divine.

Another occupation of Augustine’s mind during this year 427 seems to foreshadow the great controversy on the Incarnation which is connected with the episcopate of Nestorius. This was the conversion of the Gallic monk, Leporius, from a theory which remarkably illustrates the connexion between the heresy which in effect annihilated grace, and the heresy which divided the unity of our Lord’s Person. Leporius, a man of strictly religious life, ascribed his virtue to his unassisted freewill, his inherent moral

force; and proceeded to describe the Saviour Himself as a man who, by a perfect use of His free-will in accordance with the will of God, had merited the dignity of God's Son. This was, in fact, the doctrine taught of old by that heretical patriarch of Antioch, Paul of Samosata, who held that Jesus had become "Son of God" through His eminent "advance" in virtue. Leporius consistently excluded from his theory all ideas of redemption or atonement: Christ, according to him, had come upon earth for no other purpose than to set a perfect example. Augustine received Leporius at Hippo after he had been condemned as heterodox in Gaul, and succeeded in bringing him to a worthier conception, alike of our Lord's Person and of the nature of Christian grace. Accordingly Leporius signed a recantation, which was read publicly in the church of Carthage, and which acknowledged the personal union, without confusion of natures, between God and Man in the One Christ, who was not the adopted or titular, but the veritable and eternal Son, God over all, essentially distinguished from the Saints; and Leporius added an assertion which St. Athanasius, apparently, would not have either exacted or approved, and which does violence to some well-known texts—that Christ was not, even as man, ignorant of anything. After this explicit profession of faith, Leporius was received back again into Gallican Church communion.

But now we must turn to a more momentous reaction against Augustinian rigorism, which prolonged for many years a modification of the Pelagian debate. A Carthaginian Christian named Vitalis maintained that the first step in good action, the first movement of the will towards good, was the effect of unassisted free-will; and that the "operations" of divine grace were subsequent to this beginning. Augustine, in a letter to him, argued from the Church prayers offered up, at the summons of "the priest at the altar," for the conversion of infidels and for the infusion of a desire for baptism into the hearts of catechumens. It is, he argues, a part of true faith to pray for those who do not as yet desire to believe, that through God's grace that desire may be stirred up in them. In Southern Gaul the same disposition to deny what is technically called "prevenient" or originaive grace was greatly encouraged by the authority of such a writer as John Cassian, who had been, as we have seen, a deacon under St. Chrysostom and was now settled at Marseilles. Cassian's early training in a monastery at Bethlehem had borne fruit, first in a journey to Egypt, undertaken in order to study its monastic

system and to become acquainted with its most eminent "abbots," and then in the foundation of two religious houses for men and women in the old Phocæan colony where he finally fixed his abode. He had also busied himself in the composition of twelve books of "Monastic Institutes" for the brotherhood formed by a Gallic bishop named Castor, and was now engaged on a later work, embodying the "Spiritual Conferences" which he had held with Egyptian monks at Scetis and elsewhere: this work was also undertaken at the request of Castor, and completed at that of Honoratus, the bishop of Arles. The Conferences were welcomed by Western readers as describing the ordinary internal life of the famous "fathers of Egypt," as the Institutes had described their external usages and modes of worship. But Cassian's work, although it illustrated the stress laid on humility, sympathy, and spiritual prudence, was thought to show a decided tendency to an exaggeration of human freewill and a defective estimate of grace. In fact, Cassian and his friends, while disclaiming any agreement with Pelagius, were of opinion that Augustine went too far, not only in those points in which we ourselves should call his teaching one-sided, but on the very important point whether grace was, or was not, to be regarded as active in the very first operation of the human will as responding to the call of God.

A layman named Hilary, who in former days had listened with delight to St. Augustine, and another layman named Prosper, of Riez in Provence, afterwards well known as the author of a Chronicle (which extends to the capture of Rome by Gaiseric in 455) and already "very zealous for the doctrine of grace," wrote to Augustine to tell him what was being thought and said by the monks who agreed with Cassian, "the servants of God living at Marseilles." Their account comes to this:—These persons hold you in very high admiration, but criticize some parts of your teaching. What you teach, for instance, as to the necessity of an act of grace for the stirring up of a good will in man, seems to them to favour laxity. They believe that man can, of himself, by force of his own nature, will to accept God; that grace follows upon, and does not precede, a good will; and that this native capacity is implied in all practical exhortations, which have no point if nothing exists in man which they can arouse into activity: and they furthermore deny the doctrine of a fixed number of the predestinate and of the reprobate—assert that it tends to fatalism, and thus to despair, and cuts at the root of effort—and especially

reject your explanation of the text, "God willeth all men to be saved," insisting that it be taken literally and in its fulness; that in purpose Christ died for all, and that salvation is on God's part open to all; and while they admit predestination, they ground it on the divine prevision of good conduct. They profess to oppose what you teach and we hold on these matters, in the interest of Christian morality. They believe in original sin; and grace they admit, in its real sense, to be necessary, *after* the choice of good is made—necessary, that is, for really good work: but the choice of good, "the wish to be healed," they do not reckon as a "work." Sometimes they are content to deprecate the introduction of such views as yours on the ground that, at least, they are uncertain, and not necessary for Catholic belief. They are persons of very high character: among them is Hilary, the new bishop of Arles (he had succeeded Honoratus early in 429); others of them have also been recently made bishops; and it is "only a few intrepid lovers of perfect grace" who venture to oppose the arguments of men so far their superiors.

This negation of what is technically called "prevenient," combined with an insistence on "co-operative," grace, could not be deemed tenable, either in regard to logical consistency or to Christian ideas. It implied that man's will, unassisted, could do what, in many cases, was harder, yet could not do what was easier. For the great effort of "turning to the right," after a long course of wrong-doing, it was sufficiently well qualified: the need of special divine help began with the lighter task of "keeping straight on." And the Pauline doctrine recognised the action of God's "energy" in regard to man's "willing" as well as in regard to his "working." It did not, indeed, suppose that in either case that "energy" was irresistible: the soul, aroused, appealed to, and supplied with new strength, might still refuse to respond, might fail to use the power thus offered; just as it might cease to co-operate with grace at any time after its upward movement had begun. But that doctrine did assign the initiative to grace; and therein it bore witness to a far-reaching principle—illustrated in the Catholic theory of the Church and its ordinances, and often ignored by the modern habit of dwelling on religion rather as man's seeking after God than as a gift from the Self-revealer—the principle of the divine originative action in man's religious life. Here, then, was the blot in what is called Semi-Pelagianism; here was what could not fail to make it untenable.

And yet it is evident that Augustine's very strong statements on predestination and on the irresistibility of effectual grace had impelled these earnest thinkers in South Gaul to greater lengths than they would otherwise have gone—that is, to the denial of the necessity of grace, as a divine influence or power, for the first movements towards good action. Had Augustine been less dogmatic on the controlling, overmastering efficacy of grace; had he been content to say, "You need grace to stir you up towards holiness, but your free will is truly and really free in accepting or in refusing that appeal, in yielding to or recoiling from that awakening and invigorating touch;" in other words, had he anticipated the invaluable pronouncements of the Council of Orange a century after his own death, to the effect that Semi-Pelagianism must indeed be condemned, but that "all the baptized, having received grace through baptism, were able and were bound, by Christ's aid and co-operation, to fulfil what was needful for the salvation of the soul,"—the divines of Marseilles would surely not have assumed that in order to provide due scope for freedom and responsibility there must be secured, so to speak, one spot in the area of man's internal action in which he was left to himself, into which the divine energy forbore to enter. Thus they objected, we are told, to the proposition that the gift of persistence in right willing made wrong willing impossible and that holy persons were "helped" in such a sense as that they could not turn aside to evil. Again, if he had not preached his predestinarian theory with such rigorous and unqualified emphasis, he would not have provoked from them some criticisms which all save strict predestinarians will consider to be but just, which can by no means be treated as "Semi-Pelagian," and which in effect were confirmed by that same Council's anathema against any—"if any there were"—who should hold a "predestination to evil." And it is unfortunate that his reply to the two laymen (in other words, his counter-criticism on the Marseilles critics) in the books "*On the Predestination of the Saints*" and "*On the Gift of Perseverance*," is essentially a restatement of his predestinarian theory in all its intensity and sternness. Although he refers to the objections in a tone of respect and kindness, and concludes in a strain of touching modesty, he does not abate one jot of his stern dogma as to predestination: it is wholly irrespective of foreseen piety, it is simply and literally absolute, and therefore not to be accounted for save by reference to an inscrutable "decree." The doctrine, he

admits, can be perverted, and care must be taken in the mode of expressing it; but there it is, and must be accepted. Grace is a mastering, necessitating force, which leaves the will no alternative but to obey it; and salvation is not really offered by God to all the baptized. Thus it has been truly said that as he "still taught an 'arbitrary' election, a grace which is strictly controlling, and a will which is only a will, and not a *free* will, he did not satisfy the natural doubts, or meet the real objections, of the Church of Marseilles;" and that "the real objections raised by them to his teaching, based as they were on truth and reason, still remain."

In Britain, the native island of its first teacher, Pelagianism had shown itself—through the activity of Agricola, who is described as the son of a Pelagian bishop named Severian, and to whom have been ascribed some Pelagian letters on matters of conduct—still more successful than in Gaul. It would probably have been soon after the letter received from Prosper and Hilary that Augustine would have heard how it had just been happily vanquished there by the preachings and arguments of German of Auxerre, and of his brother prelate Lupus of Troyes who long afterwards made an impression on the savage spirit of Attila. The two bishops had been sent over to Britain, most likely by the joint action of Pope Celestine and of a Gallican synod, had prevailed over a number of Pelagians of high position and social influence, and had carried the popular mind with them. This was in the Lent of 429, and was followed up, according to the famous and beautiful story, by the victory of the British army, when fresh from the Easter baptisms, over the heathen Saxons and Picts, who fled in terror when at German's bidding the Britons raised the shout of "Alleluia!"

But Celestine was not only, in Prosper's language, "labouring to keep the Roman island Catholic;" the same writer describes him as "making the barbarous island Christian by ordaining a bishop for the Scots," as the Irish were called until the eleventh century. This is explained in another work of Prosper's, his *Chronicle*, wherein, under the year 431, he tells us that "Palladius was ordained by Pope Celestine, and sent as first bishop to the Scots who believed in Christ." The Palladius in question was the deacon at whose request Celestine had sent German of Auxerre on his anti-Pelagian mission to Britain: the notice in Prosper can only mean that he was sent to preside over the

scattered Christian congregations then to be found here and there in Ireland. The tale of four Irish bishops anterior to his mission may be dismissed as legendary. But there is still great uncertainty as to the proceedings of Palladius after his landing in Ireland, probably in Wicklow. On the whole, it seems that Prosper's estimate of his work is inordinate; that he did not succeed in converting many of the heathen Irish, although he built a few churches, one being known afterwards as "the Roman's House;" that he stayed but a short time in the island, and then transferred his labours to North Britain, the present Scotland, and died there after a missionary episcopate of which it is impossible to fix the duration: the Scottish traditions represent it as lasting for some time, call him "apostle of the Picts," and speak of Servan and Ternan as his disciples and as his successors in the missionary work. But all this is shadowy, and probably mythical: we must be content with ignorance on the subject of Palladius's history after his brief sojourn in Ireland; enough that he did for a while work there as a bishop, and that he preceded, probably by several years, the greater missionary whom Ireland venerates as her apostle, and who has been mistakenly represented as sent forth, like him, by Celestine.

CHAPTER XXXV.

BETWEEN TWO CONTROVERSIES.

WE may now pause to take a brief survey of the general condition of the Church between the decadence of Pelagianism and the rise of Nestorianism. Let us first look at the East and its affairs.

Theodosius II. had enjoyed for the first six years of his reign the signal advantage of the guardianship of Anthemius. The great prefect's last service to his young master's throne and to the capital of his empire was the construction in 413 of the first line of "Theodosian walls," enclosing a large space, from a mile to a mile and a half, to the west of the walls of Constantine. After his death in 414, the practical regency devolved on the Emperor's sister Pulcheria, although his senior by only two years, whose abilities Gibbon has estimated in terms which almost anticipate the remark of Napoleon I. as to the Duchesse d'Angoulême, that she was "the *man* of her family." As a girl of sixteen, she received the title of Augusta, and entered on a long course of practical sovereignty, of which Mr. Oman says, in his "Byzantine Empire," that being "an extraordinary woman, austere, indefatigable, and unselfish, she proved equal to ruling the realm of the East with success." With a wise "suppression of herself," she put her brother's name forward in everything, stood between him and corrupt intrigues, and spent great pains on instructing him in such knowledge (so Sozomen expresses it) as might befit a monarch—horsemanship, the use of arms, and some extent of literature, together with the minor arts of princely bearing, including the control of laughter, and the assumption of a dignified, an austere, or a gracious demeanour as the occasion of the hour might require it. Gibbon hints that she may have wished to keep him in dependence, and a later writer bluntly charges her with having been content to "make him into a creditable lay-figure

for the purposes of imperial representation ;” but if he did not learn the all-important lesson of how to govern as became the heir and namesake of the great Theodosius, it may be fairly supposed, as Finlay has hinted, that his sister had taken a due measure of his capacity, and understood both what he could do and what he could not. It is curious that Sozomen dwells on the virtues of Pulcheria, while Socrates bestows his eulogies on Theodosius. But Sozomen has the better case of the two, and has reason to say that Pulcheria “ruled the Roman world admirably, taking good counsel, and promptly carrying out resolutions.” Commendations of Theodosius must take lower ground. There was more in him than in his father: he was amiable, pure in conduct, cold in temperament, patient under trials of temper and of endurance, extremely averse to all severity and cruelty, even to the carrying out of capital sentences, anxious to mitigate the ferocity of “the games,” devout and reverential beyond all imperial precedent, interested in the collection of manuscripts of Scripture or of commentaries upon it, and by no means without taste and skill in some pursuits which might be called literary, and which procured him the title of “Calligrapher;” and the foundation of a body of public professors at Constantinople in 425, and the compilation of the “Theodosian Code” in 438, are acts to be remembered to his credit. But he had no real capacity for the great office which he nominally filled. It was something, it was much, that, being incompetent for its discharge, he was personally so innocent and religious, and content for some ten years at least to let his sister assume the practical administration of his empire. But it is hardly a matter of surprise that his character afterwards deteriorated under the influence of jealousy and alarm: he ultimately fell under the sway of an unprincipled adviser, whose ascendancy so disgusted Pulcheria that she retired for a time to the palace at the Hebdomon; and before that her brother had begun to be touchy as to any special observance rendered to her individually. At her suggestion, in 421, he had married Athenais, the clever and beautiful daughter of Leontius, an Athenian pagan “sophist,” who, on embracing, or conforming to, the Christian faith during a visit to Constantinople, had received the Christian name of Eudocia, and who—as yet untroubled by palace intrigues or changes of fortune—was dedicating the literary talents which her father had fostered to the service of religion, and composing metrical paraphrases of Old Testament books, or

adapting Homeric verses to the history of the Gospel—a singular repetition of the work of the two Apollinares in Julian's reign.

The see of Constantinople had been associated for many years with a moderate policy in internal Church administration, except, indeed, in regard to "Joannites." Atticus, who died in the autumn of 425, had won the reputation of a scholar, and of a fair though not a first-rate preacher; he had never adopted a rigorous policy towards "heretics;" even "if at times he made them fear him, yet," says Socrates, "he speedily resumed his usual mildness." He had set an example of tender sympathy for the afflicted, and sent a large sum of money to a priest at Nicæa for the deserving poor—to the exclusion of professional beggars—in that city, expressly desiring also that in the distribution no regard should be paid to religious opinion: "Don't inquire whether one who is hungry is of our way of thinking or not." Socrates believed that he had not only borne witness to the orthodoxy of the Novatians on points of faith, but had even approved of Novatian's own line as far as related to the separation from actual apostates, remarking that Novatian's followers had carried his principle to an excess "by excommunicating laymen for trivial offences." Atticus had a successor like-minded with himself in respect of amiability and benevolence, but inferior in point of practical ability—Sisinnius, who had been priest of a church in the suburb called Elæa, where all the Church-people of Constantinople used to celebrate the Ascension festival. He had been supported in his episcopate by Proclus, afterwards so eminent as a theologian and as an occupant of his own see, whom he had consecrated, without any due election, for Cyzicus, but whom the Cyzicenes, resenting this stretch of authority, refused to receive; and Proclus accordingly lived on at Constantinople, gaining celebrity by his excellence as a preacher, and affection by his goodness of heart. On the other hand, Sisinnius had been regarded with jealous dislike by one who had himself aspired to the seat of Atticus—the learned scholar-priest, Philip of Side. This person, while a deacon, had been intimate with St. Chrysostom, and therefore was by this time a man of years and experience, as well as a writer of various treatises, including a "Christian History," in which, Socrates tells us, he poured out a miscellaneous heap of erudition with more of ostentation than of good sense, confused the order of events, and was of no use either to students or to the uneducated: and the few extant fragments suggest that this

verdict was hardly an unjust one. Philip had now a sufficient strength of influence to make him a competitor for the archbishopric after the death of Sisinnius at the end of 427; but he seems to have been opposed by an equal number of Churchmen interested in the succession of Proclus. It was in order to give a victory to neither party that Theodosius resolved to promote Nestorius.

A famous abbot named Alexander from Antioch established himself about this time at Constantinople, and founded a community of monks called the Sleepless (*Akoimetoï*)—from their keeping up, in relays, a perpetual service—and afterwards zealous for Roman standards of orthodoxy. But of all monastic chiefs the most eminent was the chief of all the abbots of Constantinople, Dalmatius, who had been among the guards of Theodosius the Great, but by 428 had spent forty-five years within his cloister. We find the names of Tigrius, Samson, and Maximian among the chief presbyters; the grand church of the Apostles, the “St. Denis” of Constantinople, was under the care of Alypius; we read of Basil, a deacon, and Thalassius, a reader, both monks, and both men of zeal and energy; and among the advocates or barristers Eusebius represented the class of laymen interested in theology, and was ere long to exhibit in controversy a temperament to which “fire was cold.”

Such was the state of the Church in Constantinople. Among the sects outside its pale must be mentioned the Arians, who had for some nine years been again united, after a long internal division on the question whether God could be said to have been the Father before the Son came into existence—this question being finally resolved in the negative, in consistency with the main principle of Arianism. The Eunomians of the capital had suffered for some time the common fate of sects, being split up into parties and vexed by two secessions which were connected with the names of Theophronius and Eutychius. Among the Macedonians there were also separate assemblies for a time held under the presbyter Eutropius, who held aloof from the communion of Carterius.

The Novatians had been long treated with kindness and respect by the prelates of Constantinople. Atticus had a strong regard for the Novatian bishop Sisinnius, famous for his learning (although Socrates considers his writings to have been marred by affectations), and still more for his graceful and dignified preaching, for his controversial ability—which was exerted in the cause of the Catholic

faith against Eunomius—for his easy and kindly bearing, his habits (unepiscopal, it was thought) of wearing white and going twice a day to the public baths, and for his happy vein of repartee, which was once, according to a current story, exhibited towards Chrysostom himself, who said to him, “I will stop your preaching:” “Then I will pay you for relieving me of labour!” The reply, we are told, turned away Chrysostom’s wrath. Sisinnius had been succeeded in 408, or the end of 407, by Chrysanthus, who may have a certain claim on our attention from having once been “Vicarius” of the British provinces: while he was hiding himself in Bithynia in order to avoid the episcopate, the Novatian community was disturbed by the case, already described, of Sabbatius, on whose secession from the main Novatian body Chrysanthus, being constrained to become their bishop, did much by his moderation, unselfishness, and beneficence to improve the fortunes of the sect until his death in 419. He was then succeeded by Paul, once a teacher of Latin literature, and afterwards an ascetic, who apparently inherited his reputation and his moral influence; he made full use of the episcopal privilege of interceding with magistrates on behalf of criminals, and was said to have wrought, or been the occasion of, a miracle in the detection of a pretended convert, a Jew who had “deceived many Christian sects” by repeatedly accepting baptism “for a consideration.” Paul enjoyed the same kindly treatment from the Church authorities as his predecessors had received; the Novatians met for worship, as they had long been wont to do undisturbed, within the city; and his funeral was attended by all “denominations” alike.

It would appear that the Church of Constantinople found it necessary to take measures against the growth, in parts of Asia Minor, of the fanatical sect of mystics called Messalians, who had arisen in the fourth century, and represented a false spiritualism which disparaged the Sacraments, condemned all manual work as a “labouring for the meat that perisheth,” lived on alms, pretended to the gift of prophecy, and “got the name of Enthusiasts from their extravagant transports in prayer.” In the neighbouring Churches of Thrace we find that, by old custom, more than one diocese was placed under the rule of a single bishop. The primatial see of Heraclea, of which Constantinople itself was, properly speaking, suffragan, had for its “exarch” a prelate of Gothic birth named Fritila. In Asia Minor, Firmus sat on the throne of

St. Basil in Cappadocian Cæsarea; among his dependent prelates in the "diocese" of Pontus were Acacius of Melitene and Theodotus of Ancyra, who will come before us in the Nestorian controversy: at the head of the "Proconsular Asiatic diocese," as successor of St. Timothy at Ephesus, in the Church which once ranked fifth among Christian sees, was Memnon, also eminent in the same struggle; at Philadelphia, where Theophanius or Theophanes was bishop, Novatians and Quartodecimans appear to have been numerous.

To turn to the "Oriental" or Antiochene patriarchate. Theodotus had been for some years bishop of its chief see as successor of Alexander, the wise and kindly prelate who had terminated the long Antiochene schism. At Berœa, now Aleppo, Acacius was still presiding in advanced old age, many years after he had made some tardy atonement for his share in the persecution of St. Chrysostom. We shall meet with Helladius, bishop of Tarsus, Cyrus of Tyre, Maximian of Anazarbus, who had pronounced, in a synod of his diocese, against Julian "the Pelagian;" at Mopsuestia, a suffragan see of Anazarbus, there was still living a prelate, already mentioned in connexion with Pelagianism, who was destined to affect, in a manner which may well be called disastrous, the theological history of Eastern Christendom. This was that Theodore, whom Chrysostom had in early days recalled to a monastic life after he had abandoned it, and who enjoyed the friendship of the Saint until death parted them: but who united with wide learning and conspicuous ability a very deliberate hold on theories which explained away the mystery of the Incarnation, and indeed carried the anti-mystical principles of the Syrian school of interpretation to an extreme which may be regarded as rationalistic. In the sphere of theology he virtually substituted a "connexion," an association or alliance, for the union of God and man in the Redeemer, and taught, in effect, that the Son of God was one person, and the Son of Mary was another: in that of exegesis he gave up certain books of the Old Testament Canon, spoke disparagingly of the Book of Job as well as of "the Song," and carried his dislike for "mystical interpretations" of Old Testament language—which had, indeed, been greatly overstrained—so far as to allow a Messianic reference in four psalms only, and to treat immediate historical verifications of prophecy as superseding any further and unique fulfilment, seeing, for instance, nothing but Assyrian tyranny in the evils for which Hosea

predicted redress, nothing but Maccabean glories in the "rising of the Sun of Righteousness."

In the Syrian province of Euphratesia, the important metropolitan see of Hierapolis had a bishop of singular persistency of character, named Alexander, of whom we shall hear much; among its suffragans was the Church of Cyrus or Cyrrhos, for ever memorable on account of its great bishop Theodoret. Theodoret was born at Antioch, the child of pious parents, probably about 393, so that he might be four years old when Chrysostom left Antioch for Constantinople. He was regarded by his parents as a special "gift of God," was carefully educated, spent some quiet years in a monastery near Apamea, and was consecrated to the see of Cyrrhos about 423. We can form an idea of the locality from his own descriptions: the "poor little town" was much out of the way, and very uninteresting as an abode; but Theodoret, acting on the principle of "adorning the Sparta" which he had found, "concealed its unsightliness by numerous buildings" erected at his own cost—a church, public porticoes, baths, two large bridges, and an aqueduct; he also brought good physicians, one of them a priest, to settle there. The district under his charge was not extensive, being only forty miles long and as many across; but it included as many as eight hundred "parishes," a term here used in its later sense; it was traversed by high hills, partly bare and partly wooded; all the land at their base was cultivated, but taxation greatly interfered with its cultivation and fertility, and frightened away many of the poor farmers, and even most of those "thrice-miserable decurions" or "curiales" on whom the law laid so heavy a hand. Theodoret, during his episcopate, reclaimed eight villages (a singular and suggestive fact) from the long-lived Gnosticism of Marcion, another from Arianism of the ordinary type, another from Eunomianism; and this not without personal risk, being often pelted, and even wounded, by the heretics. They little knew his heart; he was eminently a man to be loved, overflowing with tenderness for all sufferers, affectionately loyal to his friends, unwearied in all spiritual work, and in useful work of a temporal kind as dependent on the spiritual. His unfortunate connexion for a considerable time with the Nestorianizing party does not prevent Cardinal Newman from calling him "a great and holy bishop," and from dwelling on what made the charm of his character—on his "large sympathies, keen sensibilities, indignation at the sight of tyranny," on "that affectionate temper which could

not thrive under the absence of friends," and on his conscientious care to "do his duty by his people with all his might." His letters of condolence are very touching. In one he makes use of the end of Romans viii.; in another he bids a widow think of her departed husband as having only gone on a long journey; or he treats the vicissitudes of life as a ground for more entire dependence on God; or points to the comfort which Church festivals are calculated to administer. To his friends he writes that "long absence and wide local separation do not break up or weaken a friendship, but rather enhance its bloom." As ruler of his Church, as benefactor of his city, as pleader for his over-burdened people, for whom he appealed to Pulcheria herself, as a controversialist (if not always a fair one), as a commentator of high repute on Scripture, Theodoret gave himself no rest. He was to be seen going about in shabby clothing; in the tone of Samuel he says that he never received a penny or a cloak from any man; his servants never accepted even a loaf or an egg; he never acquired either house or field of his own; he was never engaged in any litigation; he strove to make himself a pattern of self-sacrificing labour. When he visited the great capital of "the Orient," it was when duty called him, apparently once every year, to a synod; and then he used to preach, sometimes at ordinations, in the "Golden Church" of Constantius, with the approval of Theodotus, under whom, he says, he taught for six years, between 423 and 428-9, and of John his successor, who used to applaud with both hands, and to encourage other admirers, when the sermon was over, to kiss the preacher's face and hands, or even, as he says with quaint complacency, to "take hold of his knees, and call his doctrine apostolical." He must have felt the contrast between such responsiveness and the dulness of his home congregations, among which a man of his gifts might seem to be thrown away. His enthusiasm for monasticism (which developed a marvellous credulity) was specially excited by the life of Symeon Stylites, who at this time had spent about five years on the lowest of the three pillars (none of them very lofty) which he successively occupied, to the amazement, at first, of the other "inhabitants of the wilderness," but gradually attracting the profoundest reverence as a "wonder of the world," and a transcendent example of supernatural sanctity, because he stood up there exposed to all weathers, never lying down, but bowing down in countless acts of worship—a companion of Theodoret's, watching Symeon, counted 1244 such "adorations,"

and then "gave up counting in sheer weariness." Wild and fantastic as the "pillar-life" was, and sadly perverted as was the standard to which it appealed, inasmuch as it suggested the meritoriousness of self-inflicted pain in itself, it must be remembered that the "holy aerial confessor" was also active in preaching to the barbarians who came to gaze on him, and converted many whose childish natures might hardly have been impressed by anything less phenomenal.

The Church of Samosata—the birthplace of Paul the heresiarch—was governed by Andrew, a theologian of some mark. The "holy city of Edessa," devoted from the first, as Eusebius tells us, to the Christian profession, and faithful to Catholic doctrine under Valens, had Rabbula for its bishop, once a pagan governor of his native city, but converted mainly, it seems, by Alexander, the founder of the Akoimatoi, and appointed to the episcopate of Edessa in 412: he had set himself energetically to the task of education, and restored to the Mesopotamian metropolis the ancient honours of its "Persian school." At Jerusalem, not yet emancipated from the metropolitical authority of Cæsarea, although recognised by the seventh Nicene canon as holding a traditional place of "honour," Juvenal had probably been for some years bishop—the forty-third successor of St. James.

At Alexandria Cyril had presided since 412, and had been since 417 in communion with the West, after the healing of the breach caused by his predecessor's conduct towards St. Chrysostom. Time had been allowed for what a writer who has treated him with just but discriminating admiration calls a "mellowing down of his spirit;" he was not the same man in all respects as when he canonized the monk who died under torture for having wounded a worthless and unfriendly governor of Alexandria, or when he refused, at the request of Atticus, to place St. Chrysostom's name on the diptychs, only yielding to the severe remonstrance of Isidore of Pelusium, the venerable "abbot" whom he treated as a father,—one whose character gave force to the remonstrances which he was wont to address, with what Tillemont calls a "noble freedom," to "all kinds of persons," bishops, civil governors, court officers, "as to what he thought blameable in their conduct." In this case he went straight to the mark by exhorting Cyril "not to perpetuate a feud under the pretence of religious zeal." Yet although Cyril had conceded this point to Isidore, he seems never to have felt cordially

towards the memory of the saint whom his uncle had persecuted ; and too much of asperity and imperiousness clung to him throughout his long career, marring the moral effect of his zeal for Christian orthodoxy. We may mention here the names of two eminent ascetics who, with Isidore, represented at this time the Egyptian ideal of monasticism : Poemen, who united a fanatical austerity towards his kindred with a uniform tenderness towards every one else ; and Arsenius, who had now spent about forty years in the desert of Scetis, craving ever more and more for solitude and silence, weeping continually over the recollection of his sins and of the evils of his time, but never, assuredly, regretting for a moment his voluntary departure from senatorial rank and from his high place at the court of Constantinople. Kingsley, in his "Hermits," claims "sacred pity for the grief of a good man" who had failed to make his two imperial pupils so rule as to "stave off the ruin" which had come on the earth. But the pity of it was that, had they been ever so right-minded, they had no capacity for ruling at all.

Before closing our brief survey of Eastern affairs, we must add that the persecution which had begun in Persia in the last year of king Isdigerdes (Yazdegerd), who died in 420, and which was carried on with more definite purpose and greater severity by his son Varanes or Vararam, fifth of that name, appears to have been for a while terminated by the conclusion of peace between the latter king and Theodosius in 422, but to have revived, although perhaps with less violence, somewhat later. On this point, the authority of Socrates, who makes the persecution end with the war, is inferior to that of Theodoret, who lived not far from the Persian frontier, and who, finishing his history in 450, assigns thirty years to this persecution, and expressly says that it was continued by the successor of Vararam,—a second Isdigerdes, who came to the throne in 440. We may remember, in connection with it, the heroic constancy of Benjamin the deacon, who endured horrible tortures ending in death, for refusing to "forsake his Creator and deify the sun, a creature like himself ;" and the noble and truly Christian beneficence of Acacius bishop of Amida, now capital of Roman Mesopotamia, who, during the war, sold his altar-vessels to ransom seven thousand captives of the hostile Persian nation who were in danger of perishing by famine, observing to his clergy that "their God was in no need of dishes or cups." He maintained the captives for a time after they had been

set free, and then sent them back to Vararam, who expressed a desire to see a man capable of such munificent generosity.

We must now turn to the West. The incapable and despicable Emperor Honorius had died in the August of 423, leaving "his poultry and his people," says Hodgkin, "to other masters;" and after the brief usurpation of John, the chief of the imperial secretaries, who was defeated by forces sent from the East, the throne of the West was filled in 425 by Valentinian III., a boy of six, the son of Galla Placidia and nephew of Honorius, whose mother, as regent (for her coarse and ignoble, though soldierly, husband, Constantius, had died before her brother), "envied, but could not equal, the wise and successful policy of Pulcheria"—and also could not, and must have learned that she could not, make her son worthy to reign. A year before the death of Honorius, Celestine I. had succeeded Boniface in the Roman see; he had apparently, in early life, known St. Ambrose at Milan, and had been one of the seven Roman deacons under Pope Innocent. Among the Italian bishops the most eminent were Maximus of Turin, whose extant sermons attest the prevalence of pagan usages among the rustic servants of Christian masters, assert that heretical presbyters were selling assurances of divine pardon "for so much," and urge the due observance of the great festivals, Christmas and Ascension as well as Easter and Pentecost; and Peter, surnamed Chrysologus, bishop, and afterwards archbishop, of Ravenna, whose frequent, pithy, and carefully prepared sermons were held in high esteem by his flock. Paulinus of Nola had died in 424, after an episcopate of fifteen years.

In Gaul, the illustrious Germanus, or St. German, was bishop of Auxerre. The extraordinary venture of faith whereby Amator, his predecessor, had by a sort of force introduced into his clergy a young military commander or "duke"—secular in his habits, eager for sport, addicted to a custom of hanging up the heads of slain animals on a pear tree, and fiercely intolerant of the bishop's remonstrance at what he considered to be a survival of pagan superstitions—had been justified by ten years of an episcopate in which the faults of his earlier life were almost "effaced" from recollection by the lustre of his self-denial, his tenderness of heart, a "charity which flowed over the least of his actions," his ready beneficence, his moral elevation, and his persuasiveness as a teacher. His intervention in British Church affairs, already

alluded to, took place in 429. The see of Arles, which had been the scene of the famous council of 314, and of another and very different assembly in 354, had lately received as its archbishop the nobly-born Honoratus, who more than twenty years before had given the impetus to a movement fertile beyond expectation in happy results to the Gallican Church. Bent on ascetic seclusion, he had settled in the smaller and more remote of the two wooded islands of Lerins off the coast of Provence. Of these islands, now easily accessible from Cannes, the larger was called Lero or Lero Major and is now called the Île Ste. Marguerite; the other, which on its southern side confronts the wide Mediterranean, and often seemed to invite the Saracen pirates, still bears as the Île St. Honorat the name of the venerated founder of the community of Lerins. Its monastery, which ere long included brethren of all nations, anchorites as well as coenobites, became, in Dean Kitchin's phrase, the training-place of "the greatest saints and scholars of the time," one of the most illustrious religious houses in all Christendom, eminent alike for piety and learning, and known, by name at least, to all who have heard of one famous Lerinensian, Vincent, the author of the "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" A hundred years later Cæsarius of Arles apostrophized the isle as "*beata et felix*;" and we may well remember that our own Benedict Biscop was for two years an inmate of the house. Before he became archbishop of Arles, Honoratus had, as it was believed, won over a young man named Hilary from "worldliness" to the monastic life by his persistent prayers. Hilary for a time accompanied him to Arles, but afterwards returned to Lerins, and was still under thirty when, on Honoratus's death, he succeeded him in the see with which his own name is so closely associated. In the neighbouring and larger islet dwelt Eucherius, who had given up brilliant secular prospects in order to imitate the example of Honoratus and other recluses, and who was afterwards to be the most eminent among the bishops of Lyons since St. Irenæus. Contemporaneously with the foundation of Lerins, or perhaps a year earlier, John Cassian had settled at Marseilles, where he founded the abbey of St. Victor, whose venerable ruins still cover his remains: and in the same city resided the presbyter Salvian, afterwards famous as the author of a passionately earnest work on "*The Government of God*," suggested by the trials and scandals of the time.

Turning lastly to African affairs, we may here bring in the

consideration of a memorable case, connected with the prohibition, by the May-day Council of 418, of clerical appeals to a transmarine tribunal. The story divides itself into three parts, which may be distinguished by the names of three popes—Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine.

1. At Sicca Veneria, a town on a hill in Proconsular Africa, formerly a seat of the worship of Astarte, there lived and ministered a priest named Apiarius. He fell into vice, and was excommunicated, not without some informality of procedure, by Urbanus his bishop; whereupon he appealed to Zosimus, who was just then sore under the humiliation which his precipitancy in the case of Celestius and Pelagius had brought upon him, and was probably annoyed by the canon which the African Council had lately passed by way of reply to the censured priest's appeal. So it was that a small council of bishops, including Augustine, met in Mauritania, apparently at Cæsarea, the modern Algiers, on the 20th of September, 418, to discuss what Augustine calls some Church business "unavoidably laid upon them by Zosimus," that is, no doubt, his expected interference. His delegates or envoys—Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, and two priests—appeared before this council, and produced a *commonitorium*, or paper of instructions, from their principal, which claimed a right of intervention on the ground that the Nicene Council had authorised appeals to Rome on the part of bishops, and appeals on the part of a cleric from an unfriendly bishop to neighbouring bishops (*finitimos*), that they might adjudicate in his cause. Three points come out clearly in regard to this claim. First, the enactments cited really belong to the series of Sardican canons, of which the third, fourth, and fifth—or the third, fourth, and seventh, in the Latin form of these canons—refer to a certain carefully limited power of receiving appeals as granted by the Council to the Roman bishop; while the fourteenth (or seventeenth) canon allows an aggrieved cleric to appeal from his own ordinary to his metropolitan, or, failing him, to the neighbouring "bishop" (Greek) or "bishops" (Latin). Secondly, since Apiarius was only a priest, Zosimus must have had a special reason for citing the canon about appeals of bishops; and the only reason could be that he well knew the African Church to be opposed to appeals to "foreign tribunals" on the part of a bishop as well as of a clergyman. And thirdly, he must have intended at least to attempt a bold interpretation of "neighbouring bishops;" was not Italy sufficiently

Africa's "neighbour" to bring its own chief prelate within that description? The prelates who listened to Faustinus had not before them any copy of Nicene canons, and were content to say that they would observe whatever provisions had the authority of Nicæa.

2. So ends the first act of the drama. Zosimus died in the following December, and his successor Boniface I., the pope to whom Augustine addressed his work "Against Two Letters of Pelagians," took over the affair of Apiarius, but in a friendly tone towards the African episcopate, as if all were now amicably settled. Accordingly, we find Faustinus presenting to a Council at Carthage on May 25, 419, the instruction affirming that the Nicene Fathers had "said" that bishops might appeal to Rome. But between September and May there had been opportunity for consulting the Carthaginian copy of the Nicene canons, and "several codices, Greek as well as Latin," so that Alypius bishop of Thagaste, Augustine's old companion and friend, was able to say with polite archness, "One thing does still surprise me: I don't know how it was, but we did *not* find in the codices examined anything like what is now quoted as Nicene." He moved, accordingly, that Aurelius the primate should write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch for duly authenticated copies of the Nicene canons, and that Boniface should be requested to do the same. Thereupon Faustinus tried to suggest that it would suffice if "his pope" were to make such an inquiry; but this hint was not taken, and Aurelius merely remarked that of course their "fellow-bishop Boniface would be informed as to all their proceedings." Then a Mauritanian bishop made his own contribution to the debate: "Now I remember that in this *commonitorium* there was something about presbyters or deacons, how their causes ought to be heard by their own bishop or by neighbouring bishops, of which we have found nothing in the Nicene record." The passage was read, and Augustine undertook that this also should be observed, pending more accurate investigation of the Nicene text. It was resolved to write to the occupants of the three chief Eastern sees, and also to append to the minutes of the Council the (original) Nicene Creed, and the Latin version of the canons which Cæcilian had brought home with him—the version, we may observe, which has been known as "Vetus," a title which does but scanty justice to its antiquity. These documents apparently were sent in copies with the letters to the East. As for Apiarius, he made full confession of his offences; his bishop readily corrected the informalities

of the former sentence; and he was allowed to officiate anywhere but at Sicca, where doubtless his presence would perpetuate the scandal. As several bishops were anxious to get home, a committee was appointed to carry out the resolutions, and to draft a letter to Boniface. He was therein requested to write for himself to the Eastern primates, in whose churches the "truest copies" of the Nicene canons would naturally be preserved; but it was urged—in rather obscure terms—that even if on inquiry the alleged canon should prove to be Nicene, and to be observed as Nicene in Italy, still the "arrogant" tone assumed by Faustinus was such as the African bishops ought not again to have to endure. Care was also taken quietly to preclude any misinterpretation of *finitimos* by assuming that it must mean "the bishops of the provinces in Africa." The letters to the Eastern bishops produced replies, which are extant, from Atticus and from Cyril, who also sent copies—"most trustworthy copies," says Cyril—of the Nicene decrees. By "copies" we may here understand translations; and the still extant translation sent by Atticus, and described as made by Philo and Euarestus of Constantinople, under some pressure of time due to the haste of the Carthaginian messenger to depart, is evidently more accurate than the *Vetus*, although the latter may have served as its basis. The Latin version of the Nicene Creed was also corrected at Constantinople; and it is to be observed that, as so corrected, it contains none of the additions called Constantinopolitan. The documents, after being received at Carthage, were sent to Boniface on November 26, 419.

3. It might now have seemed that "the incident was closed." Apiarius had confessed and been reinstated, and the misquotation of the Nicene canons had been set right. But no; Apiarius had not lived three years in his new home at Thabraca—a sea-coast town not far from Augustine's Hippo—before he relapsed into his profligacies, was again excommunicated, and again invoked the aid of Rome. Celestine, who had succeeded Boniface in the September of 422, could not resist the temptation thus presented. He not only received the appeal, but disregarded the lesson involved in the impetuosity of Zosimus, dispensed himself from the primary obligation of testing his petitioner's statements, and sent him back to Africa with "Leo the presbyter," who was the bearer of a letter expressing satisfaction at his being proved innocent. A secular magistrate in any court of the empire would have disqualified himself by conduct so unjudicial. And so we find yet another Council

assembled at Carthage, apparently in 424. Faustinus reappears as Celestine's representative, and behaves worse than he did in the days of Boniface, attempting to overbear the Council by the name of the Apostolic see, as if its action must necessarily be held decisive. But the Council would not be overborne, and insisted on examining for itself into the conduct of Apiarius as attested from Thabraca. Three days were spent in this offensive task. Faustinus tried all means of baffling or arresting the inquiry, and Apiarius resorted now to equivocations and now to "shameless denials," until suddenly his assurance broke down, and he confessed to enormities which might have been deemed "incredible"—the phraseology employed is sufficiently emphatic, *nefandas turpitudines, tanta ac tam immania flagitia*. The bishops took their advantage, and wrote to Celestine (the famous letter beginning *Optaremus*), complaining of his legate's misbehaviour and requesting him not again thus rashly to favour "unprincipled petitions," or to receive into his communion men whom their own Church authorities had for amply sufficient reasons put under censure. They observed that the Nicene Council had "reasonably ruled" that all causes, whether of bishops or clerics, should be decided in the countries where they had arisen, remarked that they had themselves provided for redress of any erroneous judgment by allowing appeals to a provincial or to a general (African) Council, and contended that it was not to be believed that God would inspire any one individual, "no matter whom," with the spirit of justice, "and withhold it from a great number of prelates assembled in council." They next pointed out that a trial beyond sea, at which it would be impossible for all the witnesses to attend, could never serve the ends of justice; and then, by way of meeting the rejoinder that the Pope might send a delegate to Africa, they said that there was no conciliar authority for such a step. They reminded Celestine that true copies of the Nicene canons, received by them and forwarded to his predecessor, had disproved the assertion made through Faustinus, "as if in the name of the Nicene Council;" and they then alluded to a recent case which requires a passing word of explanation. Augustine had established a bishopric at Fussala, a town forty miles from Hippo, and had procured the appointment to it of a young man named Antony, whom he had brought up in his ecclesiastical household. It soon appeared that his kindly feeling had for once misled his judgment. Antony had given no proof of fitness for a charge so momentous, had held no

higher ecclesiastical office than that of a reader, and proved his unfitness by conduct so scandalous as to alienate his new flock. Serious charges were brought against him; but some failed for want of evidence, and others were disproved, although tyrannical conduct was fully brought home to him; and a Council adopted a somewhat halting resolution—to deprive him of his functions, but to leave him at Fussala with the title of bishop, on condition of his repaying its people what he had wrongly taken from them. He appealed to the aged, perhaps imbecile, primate of Numidia, who accepted his account of matters (including, probably, his plea that the recent sentence was inconsistent), and even recommended him to Boniface, who wrote to Africa in his behalf, but (having learned caution) with a proviso, “*if* his statement should prove to be true.” Rumours, however, were soon spread that the Pope meant to employ state officers for the forcible restoration of Antony; and on the death of Boniface the people of Fussala had deprecated such measures in a memorial to Celestine, which Augustine, to whom the whole affair was matter of grief and self-reproach, now supported in an urgent letter, in which he cites 1 Peter v. 3. To this trouble, then, the Council alludes, and peremptorily exhorts Celestine not to think of sending clerics of his own to carry out orders of his own in Africa, “lest we” (a courteous equivalent for “you”) “should seem to be introducing the smoky arrogance of the world into the Church of Christ, which presents to those who desire to fear God the sunlight of humility and simplicity.” And they concluded by expressing a confident hope that Celestine, in his “brotherly charity and moderation,” would no longer allow them to be troubled by the presence of Faustinus in Africa. The more adventurous of Roman controversialists have illustrated the significance of this plain-spoken letter by arbitrary attempts to treat it as spurious.

It is creditable to Rome as well as to Africa that this affair produced no quarrel between the two Churches; and we find that, a century later, a Council of Carthage under the primate Boniface read the decree of the Council of 418 against appeals to transmarine authorities.

The whole case suggests two or three observations. First, we may wonder that the Africans did not say at once to Faustinus, “You mistake: these provisions are not Nicene; we know them well enough to be Sardican.” Gratus, bishop of Carthage, had, as we have seen, in a Council held about 348, mentioned

“the most holy Council of Sardica” as having made a decree equivalent to one then being proposed for adoption in Africa, the decree in question being the fifteenth (otherwise the eighteenth) of the Sardican canons. But his way of referring to it seems to show that the Sardican legislation had not been promulgated as authoritative for Africa; and by degrees the effort of the Arian party to represent their own secessionist assembly at Philippopolis as the true Sardican Council appears to have been successful in this sense, that the name of the Sardican Council became inextricably associated with heresy, and Augustine could repeatedly assert, as a thing known to every one, Donatist or Churchman, that the Sardican Council was Arian and therefore altogether illegitimate. But there is a graver interest in the story: it is an instance of the unscrupulousness of Roman bishops and their ecclesiastical advisers—the precursors of the “Curia”—when arguing on behalf of Roman intervention in the affairs of foreign Churches. They had carelessly taken up with the opinion that a set of canons which provided for a method of appeal to Rome might in fact be used as supplementary to the Nicene: the next step would be to *call* them “Nicene,” and although the original copy of the actual Nicene canons must have been known at Rome, a pope and his counsellors would not care to test a convenient assumption—would rather choose *not* to look into the facts, just as in the sixth century the compiler of the *Liber Pontificalis*, declining (says Duchesne) the restraint of “authentic documents,” gave himself a free hand in regard to “traditions,” including such a portentous figment as the baptism of Constantine by Silvester; a warning, surely, for ecclesiastical partisans, who may be tempted to ignore evidence when it is not likely to assist a cherished programme. And when we think of the various steps by which the popes made their way to supremacy in the West, we shall not forget the moral bearing of their procedure in regard to Apollinarius, or their subsequent persistence in the use of “Nicene” instead of Sardican, any more than the dignified and resolute stand made by the African bishops under the warrant of the Council of Nicæa.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE RISE OF NESTORIANISM.

IT was on the 10th of April, 428, that Sisinnius, bishop of Constantinople, who had died on Christmas-eve, was succeeded by a Syrian named Nestorius, whose moral character was highly respected, and who had considerable gifts as a fluent orator. It was hoped, perhaps, that he might carry on, in regard to preaching ability, the tradition of Chrysostom. But he began his episcopate with a blunder. His inaugural address to the Emperor, delivered before the assembled people, might be calculated to win the applause of unthinking zealots, but it disgusted the sober-minded and intelligent, few of whom, however, could have forecasted the strange comment which his after-conduct was to make on this inaugural sermon. "Give me"—he thundered out with all the power of his fine voice—"give me, O Emperor, the earth clear of heretics, and I will give you heaven in return. Help me to destroy the heretics, and I will help you to destroy the Persians!" "So soon"—it was said—"so soon after he has come among us, when he has hardly had time to taste the water of the city, is he to come out thus as a firebrand of persecution?" There were penal laws, indeed, in abundance, against heretics of all kinds: under the present reign the Eunomians had been again deprived of the right of making wills or inheriting by will, the houses of their clergy in the "illustrious city" of Constantinople had been confiscated, they had been excluded from the army; and all heretics, diverse, as it was observed by one enactment, in the names of their sects, but united by a common misbelief, were comprehensively subjected by Theodosius to all the penalties decreed by his father and grandfather. But we may infer from the account of Socrates that these stringent laws (never previously carried out in full force) had been allowed

to a great extent to lie dormant under the gentle and tolerant rule of the bishops of Constantinople; even as Theodosius the Great had himself confined his practical severity to the heresiarch Eunomius, permitting other heretics—so Socrates assures us—to meet in their own conventicles, and to build chapels outside the cities, while the Novatians were allowed to occupy their places of worship within the walls, as being orthodox in faith.

Nestorius, for whatever reason, was bent on a persecuting policy. Five days had not elapsed since his consecration when he set to work actually to pull down the Arian chapel. The Arians were, indeed, fallen from their palmy state of prosperity and ascendancy: old men among them might look back with fond regret to the days of Eudoxius and Demophilus, or to the time when Gregory Nazianzen's efforts to reorganize a Catholic community could still be treated with contempt; they might dwell in memory on later days when, although supremacy was lost, their leaders were strong enough to set fire to the house of one bishop, or to insult the adherents of another—of John Chrysostom himself—by processional songs, as they paraded through the city on the way to their extra-mural meeting-place. Those days were gone, and they had been weakened by intestinal division; but they had had learned men among their clergy, and their spirit was still unbent. They rushed to the scene of demolition, and, in reckless revenge, themselves set fire to the chapel, in order to deprive the Catholics of a triumph and to involve the adjacent buildings in ruin. A tumult followed, and Socrates tells us that nothing but the special providence of the Divine Guardian of the imperial city could have prevented "the mischief from coming to full effect." One result of this outrage was to affix a nickname to the new bishop. Before he was ever thought of as a future heresiarch he was known throughout Constantinople as Nestorius "the Firebrand"—literally "the Bonfire." He showed his intolerant disposition against the inoffensive Novatians, and Socrates imputes to him a mean jealousy of their highly respected bishop. He was doubtless the moving spirit in the promulgation of a new penal law, professing a resolution to "restrain the insanity of the heretics," forbidding all religious meetings of the Eunomians, Montanists, Marcionites, Messalians, Donatists, Paulianists, Manicheans, and others, but merely debarring Arians and Macedonians, with Apollinarians, from having churches within any city (for, says the discriminating edict, "all are not to be smitten with the same

rigour”), and simply warning the Novatians to introduce no changes. Churches taken by heretics from the Catholics are forthwith to be restored, and a money penalty is decreed for any ordination of heretical clergy, “or, as they think them, priests.” This law is dated May 30, 428, six weeks after the new bishop’s consecration. Socrates tells us that he attacked the Quartodecimans of Proconsular Asia, Lydia, and Caria; that he occasioned bloody tumults at Miletus and at Sardis; and that he encouraged a harsh zealot, who presided as bishop over a Hellespontine town, to harass the Macedonians until, in despairing fury, they hired assassins to put him to death. The fierce intolerance of Nestorius, which Socrates describes as “contrary to the custom of the Church,” is to be remembered in forming our estimate of his character. He has been spoken of as “blameless,” as merely “the representative of an unpopular doctrine;” but what he did in the freshness of his episcopal powers may tend to qualify this favourable opinion.

We must now come to the actual commencement of the great controversy which made his name a byword in the Church, but which for ages procured him the honours of a saint and doctor in the far-spread communion which actually “conquered” the Persian Church, extended itself to Malabar and Ceylon, “diffused” his doctrinal influence, as Gibbon says, “under the reign of the Caliphs” from Cyprus to China, and in the eleventh century confronted Eastern orthodoxy by a vast patriarchate centred at Bagdad. We are approaching a great phenomenon in the world’s religious history: in order to understand it, we must remember the activity with which speculative minds had long been at work on the problem, What was the relation between the Godhead and the Man Christ Jesus? Not to speak of the distinction drawn by Gnostics between the man Jesus and the heavenly being called Christ—not to dwell on the Theodotian or Artemonite heresy, which reduced the Saviour to a mere man, supernaturally born, as some of the Ebionites had also admitted, but “divine” only in the sense of being pre-eminently holy—we find Paul of Samosata in the middle of the third century maintaining that Jesus was not truly God, and that the Word was not, as we express it, a Divine Person, but that by the Word was meant only a transcendent power, or divine quality of wisdom, which dwelt with unique fulness in the Virgin-born Jesus, and enabled Him to attain a degree of moral excellence which procured for Him the title of

Son of God. Now here the Word is considered in Sabellian fashion as impersonal—as a Divine energy residing in the Father and issuing forth from Him to accomplish certain results. It is necessary to observe this, for a reason which will appear presently. The Photinians in the next century regarded Christ as, in the essential root of his being, a man, who had in no way pre-existed before his birth, but who was the subject of a special influence of the impersonal Word, actively energizing upon him for his complete illumination and sanctification. This theory, of course, was but a form of Samosaténism or Paulianism; and it is remarkable that Athanasius repeatedly alludes to the “Samosatene” point of view as by no means obsolete, as effective for present mischief. In his third Oration against the Arians we find what amounts to a luminous refutation beforehand of the theory which became so prominent through Nestorius, as if there were already indications of a line of thought of which it was the product. Athanasius speaks of Mary as “Theotocos,” in that Christ her Son was truly God: he says that Scripture contains “a double account of the Saviour,” as God from eternity, yet made Man in time; and he distinctly guards his readers against thinking that the Incarnation was no more than a sojourning of the Word in a man, as of old He used to come into each of the prophets. In later works of his, the great Confessor points at some who, fancying themselves, as he says, good Christians, reduced the Incarnation in this way to a mere visitation, and denied the Crucified to be the Very Son of the Father, making the Word or Son to be one, and the Christ to be another, and thus annulling the true force of the name Emmanuel and of the confession of St. Thomas. This warning is the more impressive, because Athanasius, when he gave it, was contending against a different kind of error, which denied the true Humanity of Jesus by describing His body as “co-essential” with the Godhead. It was characteristic of Athanasius to be comprehensive in his survey of truth, and to put his finger on opposite misconceptions, each arising from one-sidedness, from the exclusive contemplation of half a truth. And we find that later Fathers, between his time and the period which we are considering, insisted very earnestly on the essentially personal character of the union between the Word or Son of God and the Man Jesus; proclaiming, as St. Chrysostom did, that in the Nativity of Jesus “the Ever-existing One could be said to be born, the Impalpable to be wrapt up by human hands,” etc.; or

as Amphilochius, that "the Framer of the universe, who had co-existed with the Father and the Holy Spirit, had been born of the Virgin;" or as Gregory Nazianzen, that "in the Incarnate there were two things, the invisible and the visible, but He in whom they were united was one;" that "He remained what He was, and took to Himself what He was not;" that "God and Man, in the Christ, were two natures: but not two souls."

This was no mere devout rhapsody, no poetic adumbration of a thought, no vivid antithesis intended to stimulate a passionate devotion; it was the literal expression of the idea which lay deep in the writers' minds, that the selfsame Person, or Ego, who had dwelt in the bosom of the Father as Son or Word, and as God from, in, and with the Father, did in the Incarnation attach manhood to His Godhead—did, without compromising His divine life, enter into the conditions of human life, and surround Himself, so to speak, with a new sphere of being and action: so that the work of redemption had been wrought, not by a holy human individual in close alliance with the Eternal Son and thoroughly penetrated by the Spirit, but by the very Eternal Son Himself, clothed in humanity, but retaining His personality inviolate, and therewith the attributes or perfections which in truth "are Himself," although for the most part making them ineffective, or suspending their activity, within the limits involved in the assumption of "the form of a servant." Thus, according to this grand belief, had the one Christ brought God and man together by virtue of His pre-existing divinity and of the humanity which for our sakes He put on. It was felt by the teachers in question that the New Testament does not allow us to regard its central Figure as other than single in personality. It is one and the same identical *He*, who appears as Son of God and Son of Man. We cannot, as it were, break Him up into a divine self and a human self; we cannot say, "Here speaks One who had dwelt with the Father from the beginning," and again, "Here speaks another One who is as simply a man as ourselves." The Son of Man *is* Himself the Son of God; and those who had pondered His language about Himself, the vastness of His "self-assertion" as to His authority over men and ability to give life, to atone, to save, would by degrees come to see in the more express affirmations of His divine estate the adequate interpretation of His human words and of His human ministry. In Hooker's pregnant language, "No person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, . . . the Son of God and no other person

crucified ;” and it is precisely “ *the infinite worth of the Son of God* ” which gives full significance to that which Christ either did or suffered as man “ for our life and salvation.” “ The real wonder and power of our Lord’s earthly life,” says Dr. Dale, “ remain unknown until His divinity becomes as real to us as His humanity ;” or, to speak in terms of theology, until we acknowledge His personality to be both single and divine. And the deepest Christian experience has found in this idea a supreme illustration of the Divine love. For instance, it is because the author of the “ *Dies Iræ* ” addresses our Lord as “ *Rex tremendæ majestatis* ” that we find such pathos in his “ *Recordare, Jesu pie,* ” and in those words which Johnson could never repeat without tears—

“ *Quærens me sedisti lassus.* ”

And we may recall the wonderful conclusion of Browning’s “ *Epistle of Karshish the Arab Physician,* ” who is haunted by the declaration of Lazarus that the person who had raised him up from the dead was—

“ . . . God forgive me ! who but God Himself,
 Creator and Sustainer of the world,
 That came and dwelt in flesh on it awhile !
 ’ Sayeth that such an one was born and lived,
 Taught, healed the sick, broke bread at his own house . . . ”

and then, after trying to put away the thought, is forced back upon it—

“ The very God ! Think, Abib : dost thou think ?
 So the All-great were the All-loving too :
 So through the thunder comes a human voice,
 Saying, ‘ O heart I made, a heart beats here ! ’ ”

But of course there was of old, as there is now, an intellectual trial in so stupendous a mystery ; and thus the disposition to abate its pressure, to glide from under the overwhelming conception of a personal oneness between the Word and the Christ into the easier notion of an association or “ conjunction,” would become an irresistible impulse in minds of a “ rationalising ” turn. Nor was this all : Apollinarianism, which by substituting the Word for the element of human thought and feeling in the Saviour, and, in its more pronounced form, by representing His very body as not human but celestial or ethereal, had undermined the doctrine of the Incarnation on the whole of its human side, and had long been a dreaded and detested error. It had addressed itself to devout

Christians eager for the overthrow of Arianism, and to students familiar with the psychological speculations of the time; it appealed, perhaps, most urgently, to those whose main anxiety was to exclude peccability from the Saviour; it could be many-voiced, versatile, attractive; it was bent on a career and on success. And great had been the polemic zeal which it had called forth and encountered. It had shown itself capable of creating and inspiring a popular literature; synod after synod at Rome had condemned it; Athanasius had devoted some part of his time, in his last years, to the task of its refutation; Ambrose had insisted that it impaired the work of redemption; Basil and the Gregories of Nyssa and Nazianzus had argued and declaimed against it, and the latter especially had said that to tolerate it was to condemn the Church's teaching; and the Council of Constantinople in 381 had given, perhaps, an informal sanction to a revised version of the Creed which contained some words intended to bar it out: there had, in short, been a general alarm at the prospect of its diffusion and apparently indefinite progress.

Under these circumstances we can understand how the mind of Theodore of Mopsuestia, disposed to minimise the exactions of Christian mystery, and keenly averse, on rational and theological grounds, to the Apollinarian way of thinking, adopted the views of Diodore, bishop of Tarsus, who had once, with Flavian, upheld the cause of the Nicene faith at Antioch, but who afterwards, in controversy with Apollinarians, came to think of the central doctrine of Christianity as if it admitted a personal distinction between the Son of God by nature and the man who became Son of God by grace. Theodore took up the idea and developed it. Not only did he, in his exegetical writings, minimise the prophetic and Messianic element in the Old Testament; not only did he (as we have seen) deny inherited sinfulness, and write vehemently against Jerome for affirming it; but, to come to the point, he separated the human Christ, whom he called Master (*Despotes*), from the Divine Word or Son who was really Lord and God, and who had taken him up into a subordinate companionship, used him as an instrument and representative, and assisted him by co-operation in the human functions which he had to discharge. Theodore did indeed occasionally speak of this relation as a "personal union:" he once says, "The unity of the *prosopon* ought to be inseparably maintained;" but he explained himself for attentive readers by other language admitting of no mistake. The

higher One "dwelt" in the lower one, as in a temple; the lower one was adopted into a "sonship" towards God which was the same in kind as, but more excellent in degree than, that to which all other human "sons of God" by adoption had attained; the true or Divine Son of God admitted the man Jesus into a share in His titles and honours; and as if to clear up his own position by a single, all-decisive illustration, the so-called "union" was compared to that which makes two spouses "one" by marriage. If we ask, "Had Theodore no serious motive except mere opposition to Apollinarianism?" the answer is that he was anxious about the reality of Christ's manhood and about the moral value of His human example. Considered in this light, there is something pathetic in Theodore's attitude on this supreme point of Christology. He really desired to reverence his Master, and tried hard to stretch the idea of an adopted Son to the full extent required by Christian piety. He dwelt on the pre-eminence of Christ above all other adopted sons. It was not enough, he urged, to say that the Divine Son, being God, dwelt in him by energy, as operating through him on mankind; something more peculiar, something more distinctive, was wanted: the indwelling must be such as to imply, on God's part, an entire complacency and approval. If other adopted children of God were more or less well pleasing to their Father, Jesus was absolutely well pleasing: he had not an ordinary, but an "extraordinary" impulse towards all that was excellent—a "purpose" or resolution so pure and so unswerving, that ultimately he became incapable of any divergence from good. *Ultimately*—for he had some difficulty (one touches here the tenderest point of all) in subduing "the passions of the body," still more difficulty in mastering those of the soul; but he reduced both classes to subjection more easily than other men, than the best of other men. Moreover, as he had been virginally born, so he was permanently connected with the true Son and admitted to a share in His honours. We may take the senses of "union" recognised by Theodore from the enumeration made in the Fifth General Council of 553: a "union" by grace (or adoption), by operation (of the Word upon and through the man), by equalisation of honours, by communication of authority, by a relation "accidental" or acquired (as opposed to intrinsic), by power, or by "complacency" as though God the Word were well pleased with (or entirely approved) "the man." One seems to hear Theodore wistfully asking, "Will not this be a union close enough? Will it not provide you with a

Christ whom you can not only imitate, but love, cling to, adequately revere?" Yet the Church, when her attention was called to his theory, could not but feel that the Christ of Theodore was nothing more than an Arch-saint, and therefore could not really bring God and man together. Man needed a Saviour who should be Himself as truly divine as human; nor was it necessary for the efficacy of His example that up to the last moment of a probationary human life He should have been capable of rebellion against His Father. If we say that an Exemplar must be internally sympathetic with this or that form of evil, in order to show us how to resist it, then he ought to share in *all* human proclivities to evil, the vilest not excepted; if in fact he avoids all sin, then, so far, he removes himself from our experience. And as it is, the Christ of the Gospels appears there in pointed contrast with Scripture saints in general, inasmuch as He never, directly or indirectly, expresses or indicates any consciousness of sin. Nor, if we think of beneficial effect, should we gain anything like so much from a holier John or Paul as we do gain from a Christ whose manhood was clear of all perversity. A peccable Christ, in short, could not have been a life-giving Christ; a Christ who had simply held up a pure example could not have been for man a principle of spiritual recovery; nor could a Christ of merely human personality have supplied to his disciples such a moral motive power as they derive from an actual "Incarnation of the Word." It is worth while to dwell at some length on Theodore's position, because to understand it is to understand Nestorianism. We may, indeed, wonder that in his lifetime he escaped censure; but so he did, and not only died in Catholic communion, but secured for himself, among many in after ages, the credit of being, *par excellence*, "*the* Expositor," to whom "ten thousand" volumes were popularly ascribed.

He probably died before the end of 428, just about the time when the great controversy of which he had been the most eminent precursor broke out in earnest at Constantinople. Anastasius, a priest whom Nestorius had brought from Antioch, and whom he greatly esteemed and habitually consulted, was preaching in the great church, and uttered this sentence: "Let no one call Mary 'Theotocos;' for she was a human being, and of a human being it is impossible that God should be born." The audience, accustomed to testify their feelings, and to clap their hands and shout applause when gratified, exhibited at this speech unequivocal displeasure. The term thus condemned by the new archbishop's

confidential secretary had very considerable ecclesiastical authority in its favour. It had been used by Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, Theophilus of Alexandria, the late bishop Atticus, and others, including the practically "Arianizing" Eusebius of Casarea; used, in fact, as Julian tauntingly said, by "Galileans" in general; used, no doubt, with the pleasure which the Greek Christian mind would find in a pithy compound which set forth the dignity of the Virgin-Mother, but also principally with a serious doctrinal purpose, in order to secure the truth that Jesus Christ, the Virgin's Son, was God, that although His Godhead was incapable of "birth," yet He who had from eternity been God from God, "the Only-begotten Son in the bosom of the Father," had, in becoming Man, taken flesh from Mary, who was thus the Mother, according to His Manhood, of One who was personally and indefeasibly God, but who had entered into a human sphere of being, and could therefore be spoken of both as God and as Man, so that all His acts in either of His two spheres of being could be predicated either of "God" or of "Man," as being the acts of His One indivisible Self. Technically, this mode of speech, which has its warrant in the received text of Acts xx. 28 and in 1 Cor. ii. 8, is called by the awkward phrase *communicatio idiomatum*, the "interchange of properties," which needs continually to be explained as not meaning any interchange between the "natures," but merely that result of the "Personal Union" which attaches all the characteristics of either nature to the single "Hypostasis" or Person of the God-Man, Christ. At the same time it may reasonably be regretted that the particular title "Theotocos" became the symbol of the Catholic doctrine. It challenged objection; it was open to misconstruction; it needed some theological insight to do it justice; it made perception of the true issue difficult; it stimulated that "cultus" which has now, in the Roman Church, attained proportions so portentous; and although, indeed, nothing can be more arbitrary than to say that the dignity assigned to St. Mary by the doctrine of a Divine Christ implies that she is Queen of heaven, indispensable Mediatrix, or what not, it would have been far better if a phrase which directly concentrated attention on her Son, and not on herself, could have been made the Catholic symbol in the controversy. And yet further, "Mother of God," the popular English rendering of "Theotocos" and accepted as such by English divines, is not altogether satisfactory; it does not reproduce the exact purport and aim

of the designation: "she whose Son is God," *i.e.* a Divine Person, would be a better, although a more cumbrous designation: and so Bishop Bull adds the words, "that is, of Him who is God," while the first Reformed Liturgy uses the expanded phrase, "Mother of Jesus Christ our Lord and God."

The excitement caused by the language of Anastasius made it incumbent on his patron to speak; and Nestorius was not slow to accept the responsibility for his secretary's theological statement: he was, as Socrates says, in haste to give it his sanction, and he delivered a course of sermons on the subject, the first of which was probably delivered on Christmas-day. It may here be observed that Baluze gives five complete sermons of Nestorius as preserved in a Latin translation; whereas Garnier, by piecing some sermons together out of extracts, makes up thirteen in all. Both editors reckon as first the one which begins, as rendered into Latin, *Doctrinam pietatis*. Nestorius starts with dilating, in rather vapid rhetoric, on Providence, and on the "economy" or "dispensation" of the Lord's Incarnation as its grandest exhibition: and then proceeds to attack the term "Theotocos" as pagan in conception; to cite the text, "Without father, without mother;" to lay it down that "Mary, a creature, did not bring forth God, the Uncreate; that the Holy Spirit did not create God the Word." "For the sake of Him also who employs the garment, I honour the garment, adoring what is visible on account of what is unseen. God is inseparable," he added, "from that which is visible. I distinguish the natures, but I conjoin the reverence: observe what I say, He who was fashioned in the womb is not by Himself God—were He so, we should be man-worshippers!—but He who was assumed by God is called God because God is *in* Him. Let us honour as divine *with* the Divine Word that form which received God, confessing the twofold, and adoring it as one." By the "form" as well as by the "garment," and afterwards by the "temple," he meant Christ regarded as an individual man, and thus we find him maintaining that a relative or derivative worship may be given to the "Man" as taken into "employment" by the Divine Word; and this approximates to what is in principle idolatrous, a deification of what is *not* divine. What Garnier presents as the second sermon contains matter more appropriate to this stage of the controversy than Baluze's No. II. Nestorius, with a self-complacency which must have given some offence, remarks that his predecessors had not had leisure for the adequate instruction of their flock; and

another of his sayings describes Jesus as a man who could be *called* Son of God, by reason of his "conjunction" with the Son of God, and could be "adored along with" the Divine Son accordingly. Here the term *synapheia* is to be noted as characteristic: it may be rendered variously in English as conjunction, connexion, combination; its sense was always that of an association between two persons, and thus it was opposed to *henosis* or union, which itself, however, was found to need explanatory safeguards.

It was now, perhaps, that Nestorius was openly resisted, in circumstances which might seem to justify an extraordinary method of resistance, by one whom Cyril of Alexandria describes as a man of great merit, at that time only a layman, but one who had acquired a considerable stock of learning. This was Eusebius, afterwards bishop of Dorylæum, and distinguished for his vehement opposition not only to the Nestorian heresy, but to another which arose in reaction from it and which was represented by a friend of his own. He was now a barrister of Constantinople; but he stood up in full church, while Nestorius was preaching one of his earlier sermons, and in a loud clear voice proclaimed that the very same Lord who had existed before the ages had undergone a second birth in the flesh: upon which, says Cyril, the greater part of the audience applauded him, but others were "wildly enraged against him," and Nestorius "thundered forth an approbation of their zeal," and a denunciation of the "wretched man's" shocking language as in fact involving two nativities and thereby "two Sons." Eusebius is supposed to have been the author, either then or at a later time, of a protest or declaration which all who read it were adjured by the most sacred of names to make known to the bishops, priests, deacons, readers, and laity in Constantinople, with a view to the conviction of Nestorius as a heretic and as in fact of the same mind with Paul of Samosata: "for Paul of Samosata says, 'Mary did not bring forth the Word;' and Nestorius says, 'My friend, Mary did not bring forth the Godhead.'" But it is obvious, first, that some of the sayings ascribed to Nestorius in this paper might very fairly be explained, if they stood alone, as denying merely that the Divine Son had a human parent as to His Godhead; and secondly, that the writer ignores a momentous difference between Paul and Nestorius, in that Paul denied, while Nestorius acknowledged, the Word's eternal personality. Thus Marius Mercator justly and candidly owns that Nestorius did *not* agree with Paul as to the Word, for Paul defined the Word to be "not substantive" (or "personal") but

“prolatitious,” *i.e.* to have been put forth by God as a power is brought into exercise. But he is not so correct when he intimates that Nestorius did not explicitly identify this eternal personal Word with the Son, but reserved the title Son for the Christ with whom the Word became associated. For although Nestorius apparently preferred to speak of the Eternal Word as “Word,” he did identify Him with the Son, not only implicitly—whenever he spoke of Him as “the Word of the Father”—but, on occasion, explicitly also.

Socrates is remarkably distinct, and, so to say, judicial, in his treatment of the subject. “Most people thought that Nestorius called our Lord a mere man” (the well-known phrase in which Eusebius the historian had described the error of the Ebionites and of Theodotus), “and that he was bringing into the Church the doctrine of Paul of Samosata and of Photinus. . . . Now, I have read Nestorius’s writings, and I find the man to be ignorant. I will speak just what I think, for it is not from any ill-feeling towards him that I have mentioned the faults which he had, nor am I going, in order to gratify anybody, to underrate the good points that I have found in him. I do not think that Nestorius followed Paul of Samosata or Photinus, nor in any way made the Lord to be a mere man. But he was scared by the mere word (*Theotocos*) as if it were a bugbear. This came of his extreme want of learning: for while his natural fluency made him appear well-educated, he was, in fact, ill-trained, and did not think it worth his while to study the works of ancient expositors; for, being conceited about his eloquence, he never paid any careful attention to the ancient writers, but deemed himself superior to them all.” Socrates proceeds to quote 1 John iv. 3 as being given by “the old copies” in the form, “Every spirit that divideth” (or “dissolveth”) “Jesus is not from God,” and he interprets “dividing Jesus” as separating the God from the man: on which Bishop Westcott remarks that Socrates may have taken the statement at second-hand, and, although the variant has Old Latin authority, it was apparently only a very early gloss, and would not even be a natural phrase for the separation of Christ’s own person into two. Socrates adds, “The Manhood has been combined with the God-head; and so they are no longer two things, but one: it was from their conviction of this that the ancients did not scruple to call Mary *Theotocos*:” he cites Eusebius, and refers to Origen. After a few more words about Nestorius’s want of reading, he asserts that he

did not teach Psilanthropism, and that he everywhere acknowledged the Word to be "personal, and to have a substantive being."

But here Socrates pauses: unquestionably Nestorius might speak well on both those points, yet be heterodox on the relation between God and Man in Christ. The question was, Granted that Christ was, in some exceptionally intimate way, connected with God, so as to differ widely from other men, was He, or was He not, actually one with the personal Word? And, while we admit that Nestorius, in a good deal of his language, might be interpreted as simply desiring to exclude a quasi-Apollinarian "fusion" of Godhead with Manhood, and to vindicate the distinctness of the Manhood and the human life of Jesus; that he repeatedly seems to mistake the sense in which his opponents used the word "Theotocos," and to imagine that it meant "the Mother of the Godhead," or "of the Word as touching His Godhead;" that he disclaims the assertion of "two Sons," and professes to "adore the man whom the Word assumed because of the Word who assumed him;"—granting this, the fact seems to remain, that he did *practically* reduce the Incarnation, as we have already said, to an association of a Divine person with a human person, an association unique in its intimacy, and in the dignity which the human person received from it, but an association still. And from this it would follow that the difference between this one human individual and all others was a difference in degree and not in kind. He was on that showing, as Cyril repeatedly pointed out, but "one of the saints having God dwelling in him:" a chief of saints, indeed, the most favoured of all God's creatures, the chosen shrine of the Divine presence, the principal instrument of the Divine operations, yet, in the essential core and basis of his being, "*a man.*" Yes, and in that point of view, although Nestorius would have honestly shrunk from the conclusion, he was a *mere* man. The point may be illustrated by the question raised in the Arian controversy: Was the Arian Son of God, in himself, a creature? Arians who understood their position could only answer in the affirmative; and on that showing, to give him the love, trust, obedience, worship, which Christians had immemorially poured out at his feet, was nothing less than idolatry, however that issue might for a while be veiled by the lavish use of reverential titles. And similarly as to the Nestorian Christ: putting aside for the moment the distinctive closeness of his alleged relation to the Divine Son, what was he, in the last analysis, intrinsically, personally? Only the most highly favoured,

the most abundantly sanctified, of men ; and therefore incapable of being treated as divine, of receiving the devotion which Christians had been offering to their Redeemer as one in being with the Father Himself. Nestorianism was really Trinitarian in one aspect, but in another it was inevitably, under whatever disguise, Humanitarian, or, in modern phrase, "Adoptionist." The great theological merit of those who led the opposition to Nestorius lay precisely in this—that they saw clearly, if he did not, this relentless consequence ; they discerned what his line of thought and of teaching would lead to by sheer logical necessity, whatever obstacles might stop the progress of this or that thinker towards the goal. What was at issue, they felt, was not the title Theotocos, but the belief—to put it into the simplest and least technical form—that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, the crucified and risen Saviour, was really and in Himself one with the Eternal Son ; was, in fact, that very Son manifest in the flesh ; was therefore, in the full force of the term, their God.

Zeal for this highest of Christian doctrines was in some cases united with impetuosity. The indignation expressed by some at Nestorius's utterances was so vehement that he was nearly provoked to suppress it by physical force, at the risk of tumult and bloodshed. Some priests openly protested against their bishop's teaching ; others preached against it in the church of Irene-by-the-Sea, a little beyond St. Sophia. Nestorius suspended them from officiating, whereupon some of the people exclaimed, "We have an emperor, but we have no bishop !"

Two monks, Basil and Thalassius, of whom the former was a deacon and abbot, the latter a reader, went with others—as their own narrative, our authority for these incidents, informed the two Emperors—to Nestorius's palace, by his own desire, in order to learn his real sentiments. Thrice he put off seeing them. At last, as if reluctantly, he said, "Tell me what you want to know." "Did you say," they asked, "as it is reported of you, that what Mary brought forth was merely human ?" Instantly Nestorius ordered them to be seized, dragged before his tribunal, stripped, ignominiously beaten, kicked, thrown into the prison attached to the cathedral : then they were committed to a civil prison, brought before a magistrate, sent back—for lack of accusers—to the ecclesiastical place of detention, and finally dismissed by Nestorius, after he had told them that he believed the true Son of God to have been born of St. Mary the Theotocos—an assurance

of his belief which, as they express it, was proved by after events to be insincere. But their account may well be thought to omit some circumstances.

This happened early in 429; and it was either at the Annunciation festival, or at some earlier feast of the Virgin about the opening of the year, that Proclus—who, as has been already said, was residing at St. Sophia and officiating among its presbyters, not being able to obtain possession of the see of Cyzicus for which he had been consecrated—came forward, by Nestorius's request, to preach in the cathedral. His exordium is one of those passages which make us see that an enthusiastic appreciation of the dignity of the Virgin-Mother was an element in the zealous opposition encountered by Nestorius. But after not a little of somewhat gaudy and tedious rhetoric, the preacher comes to the heart of the matter as connected with the deepest interests of Christian doctrine. He puts, and in his own way answers, the perpetual question, *Cur Deus Homo?* Why did the Word become Incarnate? Why is it so important to confess, "not a man deified, but a God Incarnate"—one whom Thomas, looking at the combination of the Divine and human natures, could hail as Lord and as God? Because of the greatness of the disease, which required so marvellous a remedy. After the crude manner of many of the ancients—which had, however, been protested against by Gregory Nazianzen—Proclus strains the Biblical imagery of "ransom" and "redemption" (which simply indicates a deliverance through a great Divine intervention) to the extent of representing the devil as having acquired a positive sovereignty, or right of possession, over man through the fall of Adam. Under these circumstances mankind lay under an obligation which it could not satisfy; it could not redeem itself from Satan's power. Of two things, therefore, one was inevitable: man would either have to perish unredeemed, or such a ransom would have to be given as would be sufficient, in justice, to procure release. But man, being subject to the debt of sin, could not save himself; an angel could not redeem humanity, for he had no such price in his possession: it remained, then, as the only resource, that God should die for the sins of all. No one else, proceeds Proclus, exists, or ever did or ever will exist, who could thus redeem us, save the Virgin-born, both God and Man, who could pay what is not only a sufficient but a superabundant ransom for the whole multitude of the condemned. In His own nature He is impassible, but His

deep pity moved Him thus to save us; had He not done so, had the Word shrunk from entering into humanity, our flesh would never have been, as it now is, exalted. We must not divide Him that suffered from the Word, for the Word became flesh: "the natures met together, and the union remained without any confusion. He came to save; but, in order to save, He must needs suffer. A mere man could suffer, but not save others; God, in Himself, could save, but not suffer. What was to be done? Emmanuel, being God, became Man. That which was previously in existence, saved; that which came into being, suffered." Then Proclus, as it were, soars upward on those lofty "paradoxes," as they have been called, of the Incarnation, which emphasize the retention of the Divine nature, and therewith of its attributes, even during the process of the sacred Self-humiliation: "the Self-same was in a Mother's arms, and on the wings of the wind; was being adored by angels, while He sat at meat with publicans; the Cherubim durst not look on Him, while Pilate condemned Him; the servant smote Him, and creation shuddered; while nailed on the Cross, He was not absent from the throne of glory; while laid in the tomb, He was spreading out the heavens like a curtain!" It has been objected that the New Testament does not warrant this sort of language. But *if* it supports the belief that the Son of God continued to be Son of God after becoming Son of Man, and that, therefore, the Person of the suffering and dying Christ was still, even in the depth of His Passion, Divine, and therefore still energizing as Divine—for to *be* God is to energize as God—then, rhetorical phrases apart, the serious import of the passage is amply justified. "O what a mystery!" proceeds Proclus. "I see the miracles, and I proclaim the Godhead. I see the sufferings, and I deny not the manhood. Behold a clear demonstration of the holy Mary as Theotocos. Let all contradiction, then, come to an end."

Such was the famous sermon of Proclus. It drew forth vehement plaudits according to the fashion of the time; but Nestorius, as a practised speaker, at once began a reply, acknowledging that Mary, as the temple of the Lord's flesh, was above all praise, but warning his hearers against the expression, "God was born," as open to serious objection, and likely to be a stumbling-block to pagan inquirers. Let them not say that the Godhead was born (obviously, Proclus had never dreamt of saying it), but that God the Lord was "joined" to the Son of Mary. Let it not

he said that God could act as High Priest; and here, says Nestorius, "I could say more, had it not occurred to me that I seem to be speaking against Church teachers"—meaning that authorities could be cited against him. He then proceeds to insist that God the Word is one, and the human temple which He inhabited is another—meaning, evidently, by that "temple" not the temple of Christ's body, but a human individual Christ. He had been amused, he said, at hearing that he agreed with Photinus. On the contrary, his doctrine overthrew Photinus: he believed God the Word to have existed before the ages, whereas Photinus made God the Word begin to exist from Mary.

Other sermons were delivered by Nestorius with a like aim and purpose. In that which Garnier represents as the second against Proclus, but which must have been preached later, he took a moderate line about Theotocos, admitting the phrase *if* used in pious "simplicity" and with no wish to "deify" Mary: in another he again contended that God the Word could not be identified with the "High Priest of our profession." But a more famous sermon of Nestorius, which Garnier reckons as the seventh of the whole series (or fourth against Proclus), and Baluze as the second, began with a bitter complaint of the insults of "the heretical," meaning that those who insisted on the term Theotocos must be practically Apollinarians (although in fact the Apollinarians themselves, from their own point of view, rejected it), or, at least, that they heretically confounded the Divine element with the human, and obscured the pure Christian idea of the Deity. After alluding to threats of throwing him into the sea, to the charge of neglecting the poor, to criticisms and cavils of all sorts—which he regarded, he says, as the croaking of frogs, or as a childish effort to annoy him—he resumes the subject. What Pilate slew was not the Godhead, but its garment: what was wrapt in linen by Joseph of Arimathea was not God the Word, but Jesus, who died and rose again: Thomas did not apply the term, "my God," to what he handled; "the Godhead of the Word, O Apollinaris, is not flesh and bones." St. Paul used the term "Christ" sometimes for the man who is the living temple of God, sometimes for the God who dwelt in him (observe here how he uses the image of a temple); and we must distinguish between them. Scripture never ascribes the world-redeeming death to "God," but to the "Son," to "Christ," to the "Lord;" nor do we, in the Eucharist, "set forth the death" of God the Word. We

may call Mary Theotocos, but there is only one true Theotocos, or Parent of God, and that is the Father of the Divine Son. Christ himself, says Nestorius, is on manifold grounds to be honoured and venerated, and even "adored" together with the Godhead as co-operating with the divine authority—here again emerges that corrupt notion of secondary worship which had been so fatal a flaw in Arianism, and which did indeed involve a heathenish dilution of the idea of Deity.

Several of the discourses of Nestorius were disseminated far and wide, and reached the hands of Egyptian monks and of the archbishop of Alexandria. Cyril had already, before the Epiphany, written his "Paschal" letter for 429, the seventeenth of his series. He had by that time heard something of the controversy, and he entered into a discussion of the doctrine of the Incarnation, in which he, like many earlier writers, from Tertullian downwards, expressed the union of the Divinity with the Humanity by the term "commingled," which afterwards he laid aside as inaccurate; indeed, even here he qualifies it by "somehow," and distinctly admits that, in the Incarnation, God the Word allowed the Manhood—"our nature," he definitely adds—to proceed by its own laws, while yet He preserved the integrity of the Godhead. Cyril explains the phrase Theotocos—which he also amplifies into words meaning literally "Mother of God"—as indicating the birth of the Divine Person in His Manhood. But when the sermons of Nestorius began to produce discussion among unsettled minds in Egypt, Cyril, being anxious lest the new opinions should "root themselves in the minds of the simpler monks," wrote after Easter an "encyclical letter" to all the Monks of Egypt. He told them that he had become aware of the discussion recently started among them by some persons who aimed at unsettling their simple faith, and who had led them to ask whether the title Theotocos could be applied to the holy Virgin Mary. It would have been better, he says, to abstain from abstruse theological questionings; but the inquiry having been made, he must help them to answer it correctly, and he does so by expressing his astonishment that it had ever been made at all. "For if our Lord Jesus Christ is God, how can the holy Virgin, who bore Him, be other than Theotocos?" Among those who had used the title respecting her was their renowned father Athanasius; and here Cyril adds something like an account—an account full of interest—of the early life of that great bishop, who was emphatically a theologian

to be trusted and followed, in that he "could not assert anything that was not in accordance with Holy Scripture." It will be said, he proceeds, that the Nicene Council did not use the term now in question: he transcribes the Creed as originally published, ignoring (as he always did) the revised and enlarged form which has been called "Constantinopolitan;" then, after some well-chosen words on the absurdity of the supposition of a Being midway between the Creator and His creatures, he sets forth the Divine Sonship and Co-equality, and the Incarnation as involving the assumption of *full* manhood, and then comes to the point—that, as the Nicene Creed identifies "Jesus Christ" with "the One Only-begotten Son, God from God," and as the term Christ, as used of Him, has an unique force unlike the sense in which many could be called "anointed," the Mother of Christ must be both Christotocos and Theotocos: not, of course, as if she could be Mother of the Eternal Word unincarnate, but as the human parent who gave birth to His Manhood, and so to Him in His assumption of it. The unity of Person in the Incarnate is proved, says Cyril, by the great text, Phil. ii. 7, the purport of which could not be satisfied by the mere indwelling of the Word in *a* man; and by other texts, which identify the Son of Mary with "God's own Son," with Him who "took hold of the seed of Abraham," with "the Lord of Glory," and which ascribe the work of redemption to one agent, Himself truly God and truly Man. Cyril concludes this letter with the liturgical doxology.

The letter was speedily conveyed (no doubt by Cyril's own arrangement) to his ecclesiastical agents at Constantinople. "It was of great benefit," says Cyril himself with complacency, "to the cause of true belief;" very many of the magistrates of the capital wrote to thank him for it: but of course it gave great umbrage to Nestorius, who employed one Photius, or Photinus, to write a reply, which was ultimately sent to a deacon who was administering at Constantinople the affairs of the Alexandrian Church—acting, in short, as a kind of ecclesiastical consul for Alexandria. Withal there was sent to him a pamphlet "Against those who, on account of the combination, diminish the Godhead, or else deify the Manhood, of the Only-begotten." The pamphlet was, in fact, what Garnier calls the seventh sermon of Nestorius or fourth against Proclus, of which some account was given above.

It would seem from Cyril's language that after the arrival at Constantinople of his letter to the Monks, and after it had reached

Nestorius himself, the latter began, at once, to stir against one in whom he discerned a powerful adversary—at first only by such literary efforts as have just been mentioned, but afterwards by employing certain Alexandrians, resident at Constantinople, to present memorials against Cyril. They had been canonically censured by Cyril for various offences; one of them for having oppressed the poor and the blind, another for having drawn his sword against his own mother, a third for having stolen money, etc. The names of these worthies are given—Chæremon, Victor, Sophronas, together with a lad whom Cyril tersely describes as “the little son of the meddler Flavian.” “No wonder,” he writes, “if such persons, the offscouring of Alexandria, speak evil of me, for they have always been evil towards themselves and towards all men.” They declared that Cyril was not only misgoverning the Church, but was usurping civil authority, and stirring up disturbances against the magistrates—which reads like a reminder of Cyril’s old feud with Orestes.

Cyril just at this time received proof that the opinions associated with the name of the bishop of Constantinople had given scandal not to himself only, but to their brother of Rome. Celestine had received, like many other prelates, translations of Nestorius’s recent sermons. He was loth to believe that they were genuine; but, in union with other Italian prelates, he wrote to inquire of Cyril. At Rome, then, as at Alexandria, grave uneasiness was felt; and the like sensation was pervading the Eastern Churches. What was to be done? Cyril’s original impulse (so we learn from himself) was to warn Nestorius, by a synodical letter, that he could not communicate with one who spoke and thought as he had done. But in the end he wrote, instead, his first letter to Nestorius, as to “his most religious and pious fellow-minister,” to this effect: “I have learned that you are very angry with me; but the cause of the present excitement must be found in those sermons of yours—if yours they are, for I prefer to think them wrongly ascribed to you. Silent I could not be, consistently with my duty and with the account I must render at Christ’s judgment-seat, when such opinions are broached: the anxiety is shared with me by Rome and by the Orient” (*i.e.* the Antiochene patriarchate); “it is for you to allay it, and to restore peace, by a single word. Pray do so, and satisfy those who have been offended, by acknowledging the holy Virgin to be Theotocos; we shall then be all at one again, and hold our sacred services

in unity. But in any case I must inform your Piety that I am ready to suffer anything—imprisonment if need be—for the sake of the true faith. I will add that, in the days of Atticus, I drew up a treatise on the Holy Trinity, in which I spoke of the Incarnation just as in my recent letter; I never yet published it.” This letter was carried to Constantinople by a priest of Alexandria named Lampon. Nestorius read it, and at first was disposed not to answer it; but Lampon urged him to write something, and had a long conversation with him, which produced a brief letter from Nestorius to Cyril, beginning with a high compliment to Lampon’s Christian goodness, which, he says, had prevailed with him: he did not feel able, or free in conscience, to refuse the request of so good a man. But his note declines to enter into the question of doctrine. “Although your Piety’s letter contains much that is not consonant to brotherly love, yet I write to you forbearingly and affectionately; but whether Lampon’s urgency will have done us any good, experience will show.” Nothing could be less promising; and the next tidings which Cyril received from Constantinople were destructive of all hope.

“There was,” says Cyril, “a certain bishop at Constantinople named Dorotheus, who agreed with Nestorius, and was accustomed to flatter him from sordid motives: a man, as it is written, of headlong speech” (alluding to Prov. xiii. 3 in the Septuagint). “He, while the most religious Nestorius was sitting on his throne in the church of Constantinople, during divine service, rose up and had the boldness to say with a loud voice, ‘If any one says that Mary is Theotocos, let him be anathema.’ A great outcry arose from all the people, and they rushed out of the church, for they would no longer hold communion with men who could think thus;” “but,” as he adds in another letter, “Nestorius not only forbore to remonstrate with Dorotheus, but at once proceeded to administer the Holy Communion to him—thereby, as every one would understand, accepting the responsibility for a speech which far exceeded that speech of Anastasius which had kindled the first flame.” For Dorotheus, as Cyril expresses it, had anathematized a number of great Church teachers of other times, as well as of living bishops, clergy, and lay Churchmen, who employed this title in the interests of Christian truth.

The effect on the Church-people of Constantinople was such as to constitute an epoch in the controversy. Already, as we have seen, some priests of the city had declared openly against their

bishop's doctrine. But now many of the faithful people also renounced his communion. The superiors of various monasteries, with the communities, led the way in this secession; several members of the senate imitated the seceding priests and monks, and kept aloof from the churches. One priest, named Philip, supposed to be that Philip of Side who had been a competitor for the bishopric, held private meetings in a house, and there celebrated the Eucharist. And this incident brings us in a remarkable manner across the path of the Pelagian controversy, which, as we have seen, was connected by various subtle links with the new questions stirred respecting the Incarnation: for if Nestorianism explained it away, Pelagianism depreciated its purpose; a Nestorian might easily adopt Pelagianism, a Pelagian might as easily Nestorianize. Coelestius, the keen-witted and pertinacious companion of Pelagius, had been compelled by Pope Celestine to leave Italy, but had found refuge in Constantinople, together with Julian of Eclanum, Florus, Orontius, and Fabius. Marius Mercator, who was as zealous on the subject of the fall and of grace as on that of the verity of the Divine Incarnation, tells us that Nestorius treated Julian with friendliness and consoled Coelestius with a letter of sympathy; but that he preached repeatedly against the Pelagian doctrines, professing his satisfaction, amid his own troubles, in the sympathy or kindly attention of his audience, enforcing the correlation of the First and the Second Adam, and descanting on the virtue of baptism as annulling the "handwriting" which lay so heavy on the unbaptized. On the other hand, it appears that Nestorius regarded, or professed to regard, the Pelagian exiles as calumniated, and as in fact orthodox: he held a Council in which Mercator and other anti-Pelagians were treated as virtually Manicheans—the imputation perpetually levelled by Pelagians at St. Augustine; and Coelestius was permitted to denounce Philip as a Manichean. Philip professed his readiness to meet this charge in the usual canonical form. But Coelestius, when it came to the point, had nothing to urge against him; and Philip accordingly absented himself from the assembly. Nestorius then, we are told, attacked him for a breach of discipline in that he had "performed the oblation" in a private house. "Nearly all the clergy said, 'Each one of us does the same on an emergency and in case of necessity'"—thereby indicating that communion of the sick was often given by a celebration at their houses, instead of by "reserved" elements. But sentence was pronounced against Philip,

who probably troubled himself very little about such a ban. The Pelagian exiles repeatedly complained both to Nestorius and to Theodosius, declaring themselves to be misrepresented and injured men. But Marius Mercator drew up in this year 429 a memorial on the case of Coelestius, which he in his turn presented "not only to the Church of Constantinople, but also to very many most religious men, and also to the most pious Emperor Theodosius, ever Augustus;" in the opening of which document he recited the accusations brought against Coelestius some twenty years before in Africa, and narrated briefly his subsequent proceedings, including his expulsion from Constantinople under "bishop Atticus of holy memory," his disingenuous conduct towards Pope Zosimus, and also his condemnation by Rome. After this, the opinions of his master Pelagius were illustrated by quotations from his commentaries on St. Paul; and Julian was challenged, "for the satisfaction of the Church, to condemn Pelagius and Coelestius."

Nestorius temporised on the question, being glad to gain what advantage he could from such a policy. Yet although his position was becoming perilous, he had still a considerable number of admirers and supporters. Some urged that his opinion which denied Mary to be Theotocos was, at any rate, not contrary to the Creed. Others said, in effect, "The Son of Mary may be called God in a derivative sense, the Divine title having been granted to Him as a signal mark of Divine favour;" others, more consistently, refused to call Him God at all. This shows how clearly it was on all hands understood that the primary question involved was not simply about the Virgin Mother, but about her Son: Who was He, and what was He, in His real personality? Beside these intelligent sympathizers, Nestorius had the practical countenance of others who vaguely thought that he was essentially of the same mind with those who attacked him. "They are making a vain fight about a term, a dogmatic nicety, and imagining a grave difference of belief when there is but a question of words." And, moreover, as Tillemont sardonically remarks, the party which had the Sovereign on its side could not be lacking in numbers; and this, for the present, was the case with Nestorius. Basil and Thalassius, in a memorial, which about this time, or a little later, they presented to the Emperor, complain that the bishop was strong in the support of powerful personages, "and," they add, "if we are to speak out boldly, of your Majesty." They petitioned for "an Œcumenical Council which might unite the holy Church,

and restore to it the preaching of the true faith." Tillemont observes that the assertion of heresy was not the only offence charged against Nestorius; these petitioners, with much emphasis and amplification, accused him of administrative tyranny, and he was afterwards described, by the great Council which condemned him, as "uniformly indifferent" to considerations of discipline and good order.

The opening of the year 430 saw a fresh effort on Cyril's part to bring Nestorius to a better mind. He wrote to him, on the part of an Egyptian synod, a second letter, which is famous as having received the solemn approval of General Councils. "I learn," he begins with studied courtesy, "that some are injuring my reputation in the eyes of your Piety by idle talk, and that habitually, selecting especially the times at which the magistrates assemble, and perhaps thinking by this means to please you;" and he then describes the persons who, as has been already said, having been punished by him for their offences at Alexandria, were intriguing against him at Constantinople. "But," he proceeds in substance, "I care little for such calumnies. Let one's life be what it may, one cannot escape these malicious assaults. Enough of them! I turn to what I consider a solemn duty; and that is, again to exhort you, as a brother in the Lord, to preach the faith in language safe to be used, and to beware of the consequences of causing scandal." Then, referring to the Nicene Creed, Cyril states his view of the Incarnation. It was not a change of the nature of the Word into flesh, or into whole manhood; nor was it that He was well pleased with, or that He took to Himself, a "person pure and simple" (*i.e.* allied Himself with a human person): but it was that He personally (in the way of hypostasis) united to Himself a body and a rational soul, and so, ineffably and inconceivably, became Man. The natures thus brought into union were diverse, but from them both was One Christ and Son: not that the diversity of the natures was removed by the union, but that they constituted for us, through their ineffable concurrence, the one Lord Christ. (These very words were adopted by the Fourth General Council.) Thus it is that He, who was before all ages, was born according to the flesh of the Virgin: not, of course, that His Divine nature was born, or that He, as the co-eternal Son, could need a second coming into existence; but that, since for us He personally united our manhood to Himself, He is said to have been born according to the

flesh ; for "it was not that an ordinary man was first born, and then the Word descended upon him:" the flesh was, from its first existence, assumed by the Word. In the same sense we say He suffered, died, rose again. The Word could not, in His own nature, feel the wounds or the nailings, or suffer death—it were sheer madness to say or think so; but He made His very own that flesh which could bear all this, and in this sense "appropriated" (an Athanasian expression) the conditions to which it was subject. Thus we confess one Christ, and do not adore along with the Word a man as existing individually, which would mean "division," but we adore one and the same Word incarnate: for this true personal unity must be acknowledged as neither impossible nor unworthy of God, or else we shall be driven to assent to believing in two Sons, one the Son by nature, the other a Son by title. And to speak of a "union of *prosopa*" or persons suggests a mere association, which would not satisfy the Scriptural assertion that the Word became flesh: *that* can only mean that He appropriated, as His own, a body like ours, and appeared as Man without abandoning His existence as God, but remaining what He was although He had taken flesh upon Him. It is in this sense, for this reason, that we call the Virgin Theotocos. Cyril concludes this letter—remarkable for its precision and for its careful reiteration of explanatory phrases intended to exclude misconception—with an earnest entreaty to his brother ("out of Christian love," he says, "I write this," and "I bear witness before God and His elect angels") "to hold and teach this with us, that the peace of the Churches may be preserved and the bond of unanimity and love may remain unbroken." It was written, as appears from the copy of it in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, in the month Mechir, or February, of 430.

In this letter the use of the term "hypostasis" in connexion with the assertion of "One Christ" is to be noted. Cyril takes hypostasis to mean "person" or "personality"—the sense, as we have seen, attached to it by the younger generation of Catholics as represented, and confronted with the older, in the Alexandrian Council of 362. Athanasius had been wont to express the idea of one person in Christ by the simple pronoun *He*. But he meant neither more nor less than Cyril meant, or than later theologians in general have meant when they argued that, as the Divine Son was already personal when He *became* Man, He could not thereby adopt a new self. His personality must be, as it

had been, one, and resident in the Godhead; and therefore the Manhood which He assumed could not be a "seat and centre" of human personality: or, in Hooker's words, there could be in Christ "no personal subsistence but one, and that from everlasting."

To a friend of his own who was also zealously attached to Nestorius and therefore troubled by these events, Cyril wrote affirming that the controversy and the consequent distress had pervaded the Roman empire: visitors, from whatever city or country, kept asking about it, "What is this new doctrine?" To be silent, therefore, was impossible for one who, as entrusted with the care of souls, had to give account of his stewardship. Reproaches, however bitter, and from quarters however unexpected, must not move him. Only let the faith be safe: he would yield to none in sincere affection for "the most religious bishop Nestorius" (all bishops then had this appellative); but God's truth comes before all things, and if one were to shrink from contending for it in the face of the world through fear of unpleasant consequences, or even at the imminent peril of death, what would be the use of panegyriizing in church those saints who "strove for it to the death"?

Another letter was sent by Cyril about this time to some clerics of his at Constantinople, *i.e.* his *apocrisiarii* or official correspondents, who had told him that Nestorius and his party were endeavouring to make overtures of peace. Anastasius himself had met them, and said, "We wish to be on good terms with Cyril; we really agree with his letter to the monks:" adding, "Why, Cyril himself, you see, admits that the term Theotocos is not Nicene!" They wrote accordingly to Cyril. He answers, in effect: The Nicene Council was not called upon to deal with this controversy, and therefore had good reason for not employing this term, so that the argument from the Council's silence is illusory: and the real mind of the party is seen in the pamphlet of Photius, or whoever was the author, in reply to me, and in that other pamphlet which imputes to us the absurd notion that the Godhead could suffer (a notion, indeed, which it were madness to entertain), while on its own part it asserts a mere association of a human person with a Divine. He then proceeds to quote a few passages from the sermons, or expository discourses, of Nestorius; and it is curious that he expresses his indignation at a supercilious sentence by asking whether the writer were more eloquent than John Chrysostom. The prospect of being accused—probably of

arbitrary conduct—by Chæremon and others, “that foul-mouthed quartette,” did not agitate him at all: he might have to appear at a Council, if Christ should so order it; but if he had to go to Constantinople, he would appeal from such a judge as Nestorius. He was anxious for peace on the basis of right faith and the cessation of heterodox language. As to the draft of a petition to the Emperor, which the clerics had sent to Cyril for his approval, he had read it, but would not send it back, because it inveighed at great length against the bishop of Constantinople as a heretic. He had therefore, he says, “drawn out a different form, declining Nestorius as a judge on the ground of his avowed ill-feeling, and requesting that the case, if it were to be tried, might go before other magistrates.” This petition they were to present if they found it necessary to do so, *i.e.* if they found him to be persistent in his plots and hostilities. Cyril would shortly send to Constantinople some “pious and prudent men,” bishops and monks, and would prepare letters, such as should be sent, and to the right persons. He would not suffer his eyes to sleep, nor his temples to take rest, until he had fought the fight for the salvation of all. “My object,” he concludes, “is to labour, and endure anything that is thought dreadful, for the faith in Christ.”

Nestorius replied in the Lent of 430 to the second letter of Cyril, writing at some length, and with hardly concealed bitterness, and complaining of it as insulting, prolix, obscure, ill-digested. With his usual irrelevance he denies that the Word, in His own nature, could suffer anything. He goes on to praise Cyril for disclaiming, in one passage, any such idea. But, he adds, could that disclaimer be taken literally? Was it consistent with other statements? Was it not practically cancelled by language which seemed to predicate suffering and death of the Divine Word Himself? Here Nestorius shows a strange confusedness by remarking that our Lord did not say, “Destroy My Divinity,” or “This is My Divinity.” He proceeds to quote various texts on the Humanity, as showing that to it belonged the Nativity and other human incidents: it was, indeed, he says, so closely connected with the Godhead that the latter might be said to appropriate its actions. The connexion produced, he admits, “one Person;” but still it appears that by this he only meant a relative union or association of the human Son of Mary with the Divine Son of God, because he could not see that the distinction between the two spheres of existence might be

maintained without abandoning or denying the unity of their Subject; and that logically there was no other alternative than the plain denial of Christ's personal Divinity. He fancied that Cyril was really Apollinarian, in thought if not in profession. He concluded by insinuating that Cyril had been misinformed by some persons, whom a Council at Constantinople had condemned for Manicheism—alluding to the zealous anti-Pelagians. The letter ends with an assurance that the Church affairs of Constantinople are prosperous, and that the Sovereigns rejoice in the light of true doctrine. He employs the words of Scripture about the house of David prevailing over that of Saul. "If any one," he quotes significantly, "seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God. Farewell, and continue to pray for us, O most honoured and dear to God!" The courtesy of this peroration shows, at least, that Nestorius did not as yet wish to carry matters to extremity with Cyril.

His allusion to the reigning family as on his side was probably the occasion of some elaborate treatises being drawn up by Cyril, with a view to counteracting his influence. The first of these was the work "On the Right Faith" addressed to Theodosius, in which, without naming Nestorius, Cyril argues against his opinions, and insists that as on the one hand Docetism is false—and as any notion of conversion of the Godhead into flesh, or any theory which made the Word impersonal, or the Apollinarian conception of a mindless Christ, with whatever plausibility it might be advocated, is absurd, and also involves presumptuous inferences—so on the other hand it is no less grave an error to separate by a "coarse division" the one Christ into two; the difference of the two combined natures must be acknowledged, but their combination must be considered in the light of a personal union whereby "the Word is not wholly external to human conditions, nor the manhood void of Divine dignity when considered in relation to the glorified Christ." In short, the Christ must be recognised as One, a single Being in two spheres of action and of life. The treatise was too lengthy for its immediate purpose, but is remarkable for an elaborate critique on the argumentative methods of Apollinarianism. It was afterwards recast into the form of a "Dialogue on the Incarnation of the Only-begotten." A second treatise was addressed by Cyril to "the most religious ladies" Arcadia and Marina, the younger sisters of Theodosius: in this, after devoting some chapters to argument, and in them

enforcing the necessity of belief in the Divinity of that Emmanuel who died for the salvation of men, he gives extracts from Athanasius and other fathers, and then comments on various texts of Scripture in order to show that Christ is God, is Life and Lifegiver, and Propitiation, and that His Death was the salvation of the world—that He personally is an object of faith, that He is one with the Son of God. Among these Scripture proofs are some which an opponent would have put aside as inconclusive, and which one who agreed with Cyril might reasonably call unsatisfactory and indeed superfluous. The great point which he is urging is rather embarrassed than aided by weak inferences imbedded in a mass of good evidence, which includes not only direct statements (among which Cyril undoubtedly reckons the text, Titus ii. 13, about “our great God and Saviour”), but a number of passages which represent the claims and the power of Christ in a light which, but for His Divine Co-equality, would be irreconcilable with the obligations of Monotheism. The indefatigable pen of Cyril followed up this second treatise by a third, addressed “to the most religious Empresses Pulcheria and Eudocia,” the sister and the wife of Theodosius. In it he goes over much the same ground of Scriptural argument, but specially aims at the explanation of passages relied on by those whom we may now call Nestorians, passages relating to Christ’s Humanity, but consistent, Cyril argues, with the Divinity of His person. As man—that is, in regard to the manhood which He condescended to assume by what Cyril, like Athanasius and others, calls the “economy” of the Incarnation—He could be liable to infirmities, subject to limitations, capable of exaltation, remaining, all the while, the essential Son of God.

Whatever criticisms may be made on some portions of these three treatises as attempting to strain texts beyond their natural meaning, or to infer more than can be legitimately deduced from them, it is undeniable that Cyril exhibits a remarkable acuteness, versatility, and fertility of suggestion, pervaded and quickened by the great idea which holds possession of his mind. As little can it be doubted by any who look at these writings, that the true interest of the question for him was an essentially Christian interest; he believed that the dignity, the honour, the redemptive efficiency, of Jesus Christ Himself were at stake, and therewith the life of Christianity. He was so absorbed in this anxiety that he forgot considerations of mere policy,

and never reflected that, by addressing the "Princesses" apart from Theodosius, he might be wounding the susceptibilities of a Prince whose weakness of character did not make him less jealous of his imperial dignity, or less suspicious of whatever might tend to constitute in the case of Pulcheria an interest separate from his own.

So stood matters, as regards Cyril and Nestorius, in the early summer of 430. We may now pass on to another scene in the drama, resulting from the application of both the contending parties to a brother-prelate, inferior probably to both in personal ability, but strong in the great name and far-spread influence of the first of Christian sees—Pope Celestine of Rome. But in order to estimate this new development, we must go back to the year 429.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE COUNCILS OF ROME AND ALEXANDRIA.

NESTORIUS made his first attempt to produce a favourable impression, by personal correspondence, on the mind of his Roman brother shortly after the moment when the first circulation of discourses ascribed to him had begun to cause disquiet or indignation in the Roman Church. He sent to Celestine, by a certain Antiochus, copies of his expository discourses in "quaternions," that is, in sheets of book form; and with them, Cyril tells us, "a long letter" setting forth his opinions—a letter which Garnier identifies with a fairly short one, still extant in Latin (but not among Marius Mercator's versions), and dates about Easter, 429. In it Nestorius takes occasion to write from the circumstance that Julian, Florus, Orontius, and Fabius are day by day importuning the Emperor and himself to have their case examined. For his own part—so he professes—he was insufficiently informed about them; therefore he must ask Celestine to tell him what was the true state of the matter. And so he passes, naturally as it were, to the subject of the Incarnation controversy. Some clerics were renewing the Apollinarian heresy and confounding the Godhead and the Manhood in regard to Christ. They use the term "deify" in regard to His flesh, which is nothing less than to destroy the reality of both flesh and Godhead; and they shrink not from calling Mary "Theotocos," a term unknown to the Nicene Council, and unknown to Scripture which calls her the mother of Christ, although it "might be tolerated" in the sense of affirming the inseparable Temple of God the Word (he means, the man Jesus) to have been "derived from her; not that she is the mother of the Word, for no one is the parent of a being older than herself." He wrote more than once again: an extant letter renews the topic of Julian and his friends. "I have more than once," he tells Celestine, "written

to you." "I am really anxious," he proceeds, "to hear from you whether I am to regard these memorialists, who weary me with their lamentations, as heretics reprobated and expelled by the West, or as orthodox persons oppressed by slander. Will you then have the kindness to inform me,—are they, or are they not, worthy of sympathy? Day after day I put them off without an answer, because I am hoping for a letter from your Blessedness." In this language one cannot but observe a diplomatic insincerity; it was impossible for Nestorius to be really uninformed as to the view which the Western Church took of the Pelagians. Then follows another description of the alleged attempt to confound the impassible and the passible natures: and here Nestorius verbally admits that these natures were joined together in "one Person;" but it would appear, as before, that he did not use "Person" in the sense of a single Being. This letter was brought to Rome by Valerius, a chamberlain of great influence at the court of Constantinople. It may be convenient here to add that the Pelagian exiles mentioned by Nestorius were soon afterwards driven away from Constantinople by Theodosius, in consequence of the memorial presented against them by Mercator; and Celestius, somewhat later, shared their fate, on which occasion he received a letter of respectful sympathy from Nestorius himself, who compares his sufferings to those of the saints and even the martyrs of Scripture, and bids him take comfort in the thought that true religion had always to "run through diverse trials:" he must not "betray the truth" by falling away from it.

The discourses of Nestorius, as sent by him to Rome, were in Greek, as were his letters also; and it was therefore necessary for Celestine to get these documents translated into Latin, an operation which took up some time. While it was in process, the Pope received a letter from Cyril, who had never yet written to him—had not even replied to his letter—on the subject of Nestorius. Now he broke silence, compelled, as he expresses it, by necessity "for God demands that we shall be on the alert in these cases, and long custom of the Churches persuades me to make the facts known to your Holiness. Never yet have I written to your Piety, or to any other of my fellow-ministers, concerning him who is now at Constantinople and is governing that Church; for I believe that hastiness in such matters cannot be free from blame. But now, as we are come to the height of the mischief, I have thought I must needs speak." He then gives a summary of events,

dwelling of course on the speech of Dorotheus, and on its having followed upon his own endeavours to convince Nestorius of his error. He tells Celestine of the open schism at Constantinople; of his own second letter to Nestorius; of its failure as a means of reclaiming him; of the distress which Nestorius had caused to the Eastern and Macedonian bishops and to the Church in general; of the mischief which he was doing to his own people; and then, having practically suggested to Celestine the line to be taken, he asks him in very deferential terms to "formulate his opinion" on the practical question, Should communion be maintained with Nestorius or not? And let that opinion, he adds, be communicated to the other prelates concerned. He sends with this letter—which represented the minds of his suffragans—copies of Nestorius's papers and letters in "tomes containing paragraphs" translated into Latin "as well as it could be done at Alexandria." The bearer was his deacon Posidonius (afterwards ordained a priest), to whom also he gave a very interesting and lucid paper of instructions, which puts the case, as he viewed it, into a few terse words. The heresy of Nestorius, he says, consists in this: it represents God the Word as having foreseen that the Son of Mary would be holy, and having chosen him, given him a miraculous birth, with the privilege of bearing His own titles, as Son, Lord, God: thus the Son of God, the Only-begotten, is said to be "incarnate," because He is ever *with* the holy Son of Mary, as He was with the prophets, but in closer connexion—for he avoids the term "union." Thus the Virgin-born was not true God, but was called so by Divine favour. Cyril adds that he himself believes the Word to have been in His own nature impassible, but to "have suffered in the flesh." Nestorius, he adds, holds that it was "a man"—meaning thereby a separate human individual—who suffered and rose again. He proceeds to state the facts as to the treatment of the priest Philip by Nestorius. After thus taking steps to inform Celestine, he wrote to the aged Acacius of Beroëa, dwelling on the audacity of Dorotheus. Acacius replied by dwelling on the unprofitableness of Apollinarian speculations, by exhorting Cyril to labour for peace, and by deploring the outbreak of such a controversy. The language of Dorotheus was, he admits, indefensible, but the best thing to be done is to hush the matter up: in this the bishop of Antioch (John, who had held the see only two years, but who had won a high reputation) agrees with him.

We must now follow Posidonius to Rome. Celestine was greatly pleased with Cyril's letter, and with the care taken to send him a Latin version of the Nestorian papers: the version executed at Rome was probably compared with it, and Celestine gathered from them that Nestorius had written much that was obscure, much that was inconsistent, but also something that was openly and unequivocally heretical, as to the Incarnate Person of the Word and "the Divinity of Christ our God and Saviour." Having already, as it seems, employed Cassian (through the agency of his archdeacon Leo) to prepare a treatise on the whole doctrine of the Incarnation, Celestine summoned a synod of bishops at the beginning of August, 430. This assembly considered the Nestorian documents, compared the copies sent from Constantinople with those sent from Alexandria, and both sets with the approved teaching of Latin Fathers; and Celestine brought forward an interesting reminiscence of his own youth, when he had visited Milan in the time of its great Saint and Doctor. "I remember how the blessed Ambrose taught the people to sing together in Church on the feast of the Nativity—

‘Veni, Redemptor gentium,
Ostende partum Virginis;
Miretur omne sæculum:
Talis decet partus Deum.’

There," said Celestine, "you see how perfectly this hymn of Ambrose agrees with the term 'Mother of God,' as defended by Cyril, and with our belief that the Son of the Virgin was Very God." The Council's resolutions were expressed by letters from Celestine to Cyril and to Nestorius, which now call for our attention.

To Cyril was sent a letter warmly commending his zeal for the truth, as worthy of a good shepherd and of a powerful theologian. It is the cause, writes Celestine in effect, of "Christ our God;" and our duty now is, if possible, and in conformity to the earnest desire of Christ for the recovery even of a single lost sheep, to rescue from "the precipice" on which he stands one "who has forgotten the name and profession of a pastor;" or if this be past hoping for, if he persists in his obstinacy, then to drive him away, as a wolf, from the fold. In that case, therefore, those whom he has excommunicated must be recognised as in our communion, and he must be told that he is excluded from it. "Accordingly"—we must observe the exact words here—"the authority of our

see having been attached to you, act in our stead with full power, and carry out with rigorous strictness this decision: that either he shall, within ten days reckoned from the date of this monition of ours, cancel those unsound teachings of his by a written profession, and declare that he holds that faith about the birth of Christ our God which the Roman Church, and the Church of your Holiness, and the whole of our religion, hold; or else, if he will not do this, your Holiness shall at once provide for that Church (of Constantinople), and he must understand that he must needs be separated from our body." The like warning, or intimation, Celestine adds, "I have sent to our brethren John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Philippi, in order that our sentence, or rather the divine sentence of our Christ, respecting him may be known." (The "divine sentence" means the authority of Scripture, as excluding Nestorianism.) This letter was dated on the 3rd of the Ides of August, *i.e.* August 11, 430. The letter to John is extant, and informs him that Nestorius has by his own writings, sent to Celestine by himself, left no doubt as to his heterodoxy; therefore "we separate Nestorius, and any one who says what he says, from our communion, until in writing he condemns what he has perversely begun to teach," and professes that he follows the faith kept by the Roman, by the Alexandrian, and by the whole Catholic Church: "and it is evident that any one excommunicated or deprived by him or his followers, since he began to teach error, remains in communion with us."

Next we must look at Celestine's letter to Nestorius, dated on the same day, or, according to one reading, on the previous day, *i.e.* August 10. It is very lengthy and verbose: beginning with a reference to the good report of Nestorius which had been received at the time of his appointment, Celestine goes on to say that he has read, in a Latin version, the papers sent by Nestorius, and that in them he finds matter contrary to the faith. "Cyril has admonished you"—so he proceeds in substance—"once and twice; I now give you the third admonition. You have become a wolf instead of a shepherd. My duty to Christ puts an end to further forbearance. I hear that some clerics have been driven by you out of your city: they have the honour of being confessors, but I grieve that their persecutor is their bishop. As for those heretics about whom you consulted me, as if you did not know the facts about them, they were justly ejected from their sees: you ought not, surely, to have patronised them, for I read in your writings

very sound language as to original sin; and you need not have been without information on their case, for Atticus knew all about it and condemned them. But as to your own matters, 'Physician, heal thyself!' If you wish to continue in communion with myself, and with the bishop of Alexandria, teach what he teaches; and, in a word, unless within ten days from this admonition" (he means, of course, from Nestorius's reception of it) "you condemn in writing what you have taught against the faith, and assert as to Christ our God the doctrine held by the Roman, by the Alexandrian, by the whole Catholic Church, you must understand that you are ejected from all fellowship with the Catholic Church."

Let us observe what this comes to. Celestine is not writing in the character of Supreme Bishop of Christendom; he is not professing to decide the question at issue as if he were the sole mouthpiece of the Church, or his tribunal its court of final appeal: he is resolving, as bishop of Rome and Western patriarch, to withdraw his communion from one brother patriarch in a certain case contemplated, and he instructs another to act in that case, as holding, so to speak, his proxy; and this arrangement he signifies to a fourth patriarch, with a view to a common understanding and co-operation. What he says to Cyril is, in brief, "If he will not satisfy us in respect of doctrine, we will communicate with him no longer: tell him so in my name and in your own, and act for me as for yourself; this will amount to a common decision on the part of Rome and Alexandria, and I will take steps for securing the assent of Antioch and of other sees, so that it shall carry with it the combined judgment of the whole episcopate, and therein of the whole Catholic Church." When Nestorius should, on his obstinate persistence in error, be separated from the body of what Celestine, in Cyprianic phrase, calls "our college," he would necessarily be *ipso facto* separated from the Catholic communion as a whole. This mode of action was quite intelligible and natural in the existing relations of the great sees to each other at this period; it would be quite unintelligible and unnatural, had those relations then been such as are required by the Papal claim on the present Roman theory.

Another letter was sent by Celestine to the clergy and Catholic laity of Constantinople. He addresses them on the ground that, as the teacher of the Gentiles bore "the care of all the Churches," and was ready to sympathize with any of his brethren, so he himself, though far distant from them, feels near to them

in the unity of the Church, is paternally anxious for them, is kindled with the fire of zeal with which they are burning. (He refers here to 2 Cor. xi. 28, 29.) Nestorius, he grieves to know, teaches error against the Virginal Birth and the Divinity of Christ. How unlike John, their great bishop, whose discourses, building up Catholic faith, are read all the world over; or Atticus, who "drove away the madness of heretics;" or Sisinnius, who understood so well the duty of guarding the faith in its integrity! Then, after a good deal of rather wearisome amplification, he exhorts the oppressed clergy, and all who are dedicated to God's service, to contend and endure manfully, and bids them take example from Athanasius. "Who cannot find comfort in his endurance? Who cannot derive a lesson from his constancy? Who cannot be encouraged by his long-desired return? He was ejected—he suffered—he imitated the apostle and gloried in tribulations. He found shelter in our country" (Celestine is thinking, with just pride, of the hospitality of Julius), "and was refreshed by communion with this see, whence Catholics always receive help: in all his afflictions, he never felt weariness;" and Celestine adds that no Christian can be exiled in respect to God. "The authority of our see defines that any one excommunicated by Nestorius continues in communion with us: what I am now saying embraces all." He adds that as he is parted from them by sea and land, he has appointed Cyril to represent him; and he appends a copy of the prospective sentence against "the person in question."

All these letters, and other papers necessary for the business, were entrusted by Celestine to Cyril's messenger Posidonius, who brought them to Alexandria, whence they were sent on by Cyril to their respective destinations, the letter for Nestorius being for a while kept back. At the same time Cyril wrote to John of Antioch, explicitly ascribing Celestine's letter to the Council of bishops recently held at Rome, and laying stress on their decision as being one with which "those must comply who cling to communion with the whole West." "It is for your Piety to consider what is best to be done," says he with a curious diplomatic touch; "I mean to follow their judgment, because I am afraid of losing their communion: what has weighed with them is no trivial matter, but the interest of the faith." If he had believed the Pope's sole decision to carry with it, *ipso facto*, that of the Church, he would never have written thus: he would never have merged the duty of obeying the Pope in the desirableness of keeping on terms with

"the Westerns." He wrote in the same sense to Juvenal of Jerusalem, but brought Celestine personally forward as having by his letter formulated a plan of action: in this letter, as so often elsewhere, he insists that to deny the Virgin to be Theotocos is to deny the real Divinity of "the Emmanuel on whom our hope of salvation depends."

John of Antioch, on receiving Cyril's communication and Celestine's, took counsel with Theodoret and five other bishops, and wrote a remarkable letter to his friend Nestorius. "Candour," he urges, "is indispensable among friends. I beg you to bear with me if I advise you in the present crisis: read these letters of our brethren Celestine and Cyril" (he pointedly puts them together) "which I now send you, without passion or resentment; call in some friends as counsellors; let us look into this affair. Celestine desires you to take your choice between two alternatives within ten days. Really, a few hours should be sufficient! I cannot doubt that you agree with the holy fathers; why hesitate about using the term Theotocos, which they used? It is a mere fact that you have occasioned great disquietude, great dissension; you have reopened the wound, the gap, between Constantinople and the West, which our father Acacius did so much, laboured so hard, to close. Theodore did not refuse to reconsider, to retract, language which you and others objected to: after a few days he frankly came forward and for the Church's sake corrected his own words; and every one loved him all the better." (The reference apparently is to a negation of the title Theotocos.) "I do not ask you to say, like a little boy, that you did wrong; but as I understand you to have said that you object to the term (as used without explanation), not to a sound meaning attached to it, I beg you to accept it in its sound meaning, and to remember that many great teachers have used it, and not one has ever rejected it. Certainly, to deny the sound meaning—to say that He who undertook for our sake that marvellous "Economy" was *not* God, that the Word did *not* make Himself of no account by that ineffable and most gracious condescension,—this would be to err most grievously, and to contradict the Scripture, which affirms that God's only-begotten Son was 'born of a woman.' It was to express this truth that the term Theotocos was adopted. It is safe to use it as the fathers used it; and at a time of imminent peril to Christian peace, what is thus the safe course is the course of urgent duty."

And now, considering that it was time to act, Cyril assembled a Council at Alexandria, most likely in November. It is clear that he was in no hurry to carry out Celestine's commission: he waited for several weeks, in order to avoid the appearance of hastiness and in order to assemble his suffragans for synodical consultation. When they met in full numbers, he laid the whole case before them, and a synodical letter was the result, the famous third letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the letter of the Twelve Anathematisms. It begins by citing the words of "our Saviour," "He that loveth father and mother more than Me is not worthy of Me," and applies them to the duty of preferring the Faith to all other considerations. Then it refers to the letter of Celestine to Nestorius, which was to be transmitted with it, and states the resolution therein announced as that of the Council of Rome held under the presidency of their "fellow-minister" Celestine—who, we observe, is not put forward as individually supreme. What Nestorius has to do, if he would retain communion with Rome and Alexandria, is not merely to profess the Nicene Creed—which is thereupon set forth at length—but to adhere to its true meaning; "for although you profess it in words, you have interpreted it perversely." Moreover, Nestorius must in writing anathematize his own errors, and confess the true faith. Then comes the doctrinal statement, which became so important in the controversy. We may summarise it as follows:—

The doctrine of the Incarnation, involved in the Creed of the Nicene fathers, is, that the only-begotten Son, God of God, was made Man; that is, He was really born of the Virgin, for He assumed flesh from her. This condescension or self-humiliation (which Cyril habitually calls *kenosis*, with a reference to Phil. ii. 7) is not to be conceived of as involving any abandonment of, or change in, His divinity, nor any conversion of "flesh" into divinity, or of divinity into "flesh." The Christ is single, is one, is at once the Eternal Word and the Virgin-born, is not individually separate from the Word, so as to be thought of apart from Him; not a mere man clothed with God, as was in a measure the case with the saints; not a mere man connected with the Word by a so-called union of dignity (which would be unreal), nor by a juxtaposition, nor by such a participation as is non-essential (in technical phrase, accidental or non-intrinsic); and we must specially avoid the term "connexion," as quite inadequate to express the union whereby the Word Himself, being truly God,

became for us truly Man. The point is, that we have not two Christs in connexion with each other, but one Christ, impassible in His own original or divine nature, but passible in that flesh which He took for His own. This comes out in our belief as to the bloodless service of the Holy Eucharist. We therein partake of the Flesh and Blood of Christ; but we regard it, not as the flesh of a holy man, associated with, or inhabited by, the Word, but as the flesh which belongs to the Word: it is life-giving just because He, being Life as God, gave a life-giving power to the flesh which He assumed; it would not be life-giving, if it were not thus really His. Then, as to those sayings of Christ in the Gospels which are cited against this Personal Union: they do but prove His real Manhood, and we who acknowledge it find no difficulty in His having spoken in accordance with it; they are quite consistent with our belief in one Incarnate "Hypostasis," one Lord Jesus Christ, who became our sinless High Priest and Sacrifice in His Manhood, but at the same time possessed, and used, and sent forth, the Holy Spirit as His own, by virtue of His Godhead; who united the Manhood to Himself personally, and that through a woman who was "Theotocos" because, though she could not be parent of the Word *as* the Word, she yet gave physical birth to the flesh which He took, and therein to Him who had made it His own.

Here, properly speaking, the synodical letter ended. But "the things to be anathematized" were, in Cyril's opinion, insufficiently marked; and he accordingly appended twelve anathematisms, intended to leave no loophole for evasion, so that Nestorius was required, not simply to accept the term Theotocos, and to acknowledge the Hypostatic or Personal Union, but to disown in detail every phrase of the inculcated theory.

Briefly, then, the errors to be disclaimed by Nestorius were the following; it was worthy of anathema—

1. Not to acknowledge that Emmanuel is really God, and that therefore Mary is Theotocos.

2. Not to acknowledge that the Word has been "hypostatically" united to flesh, and is one Christ, God and Man.

3. To say that the Incarnation involved a mere association of dignity between two Persons, not a "natural" union.

4. To assign the Scripture sayings about Christ to the Word and to *a* Man, or human individual, respectively.

5. To call Christ a "God-bearing Man," not truly God as being God's Son Incarnate.

6. To say that the Word is "God" or "Lord" of Christ, instead of being God and Man.

7. To say that the Word wrought on Jesus as on a man, and put His own glory on him as on a separate individual.

8. To say that the man supposed to be assumed by the Word is to be worshipped, and called God, along with the Word, as one (person) with another; whereas the Emmanuel is to be honoured with *one* worship.

9. To say that the Spirit by which Christ wrought was not His own, but foreign to Himself.

10. To say that Christ is our "High Priest and Apostle" as a person distinct from the Word, or that He offered sacrifice for Himself, and not for us only.

11. To say that Christ's Flesh is not the Word's own, and therefore life-giving, but the flesh of another person connected with, or inhabited by, the Word.

12. To say that the Word did not, in the flesh, suffer death.

Such were the memorable Anathematisms of Cyril. In drawing them up, he doubtless thought that he was doing his simple duty, and clearing away, once for all, every element of a destructive heresy from the ground of the Church. But, while we acknowledge his motives, and make no question of the erroneousness of the propositions thus denounced as flowing from the original denial of "the Theotocos," we must observe that, in propounding these anathemas for the acceptance of Nestorius at this moment, Cyril and his brethren outstepped the lines of moderation, prudence, and even of Christian equity. True, the Nicene Creed in its original form, as they used it, ended with anathemas against the Arian statements. But the Alexandrian Council, even when acting with that of Rome, was not an œcumenical synod; and its anathemas, of which, apparently, Rome knew nothing, were far more detailed than the Nicene; and as, *ex hypothesi*, there was still a possibility of reclaiming Nestorius, it was a grave mistake to present to him, with a preemptory menace, so long a string of sentences condemnatory of his own alleged assertions—a series of orthodox statements cast into the hardest and most imperative mould, and quite certain to be isolated from the letter which was to expand their purport. To do this was to throw away the chance of impressing him; a shorter test might have been substantially

adequate, and would assuredly have avoided the appearance of harsh dogmatism; and further, whereas the letter itself led up only carefully and gradually to the crucial term around which the controversy had gathered, an acceptance of that term was placed in the very forefront of the anathemas to be subscribed. Nor had Cyril taken all needful pains in the choice of his phraseology: some of the anathematisms, *e.g.* the third and the twelfth, were at least one-sided in their wording, and needed a favourable interpretation to clear them from the charge of neglecting or obscuring another aspect of the twofold mystery—the distinctness and reality of Christ's Manhood. For in the one, the term "natural" might suggest a fusion of natures; in the other, there was need of more emphatic limitation of the sphere of our Lord's sufferings. Nor was there, in some others, a sufficient recognition of His dependence, in His humanity, on His Father's support, and on the presence of the Holy Spirit, as mysteriously consistent with the operation of His own divinity. Hence came trouble enough to Cyril and his friends—passionate criticisms, imputations of "Apolinarianizing," perplexity, dissension, a call for elaborate explanations, a protracted uncertainty as to the standing of these twelve "articles" in the Church. When explained by other language of Cyril's, they will commend themselves to any thoughtful student who believes Jesus Christ to be literally God. But in themselves they certainly, for the time, tended rather to complicate than to simplify the question at issue. It is but right, however, to remember that Cyril never supposed his phrases, or any phrases, to be properly adequate to the mystery: that mystery was, he felt, vaster and deeper than all thought could fathom.

No adequate sense of future difficulties can have been present to the eager mind of the great Egyptian theologian, when he entrusted the document to four bishops, Theopemptus, Daniel, Potammon, and Macarius, and with it the Roman letter of warning or "judgment," and two letters from himself and his synod to the clergy and laity, and to the monks, of Constantinople. In the former of these, Cyril excuses himself for not having acted sooner in defence of the faith. He had been hoping that "the most pious bishop Nestorius" would have been moved by remonstrance to correct his error. That hope was all but gone. If Nestorius should refuse this last summons, it would be their duty to hold no intercourse with him. All faithful persons excommunicated by him were assured of the communion of Rome and Alexandria.

To the monks a shorter exhortation, in the same tone, was addressed; and thus, in the latter part of November, some three months after the Roman Council, the Alexandrian deputies set forth on an errand which was manifestly critical, and might prove to be highly dangerous. It was no light task to bear such a missive to the bishop of Constantinople in his own city, and within reach of full imperial support. When Cyril saw them sail out of the Great Harbour, he must have been thrilled with a consciousness that the die was indeed cast: he probably expected a struggle, a far-spreading conflict, perhaps a schism, and a collision with the Emperor; but he had hardly, we may think, contemplated the change of affairs and the new forms of difficulty which, nevertheless, were close at hand. In order to understand them, we must, as it were, place ourselves at Constantinople before the arrival of the deputies from Alexandria.

It had already been thought by some opponents of Nestorius that a General Council would afford the only remedy for the existing troubles. But he himself and his friends might hope to work such a Council in their own interest; and it was, in fact, at his request that Theodosius resolved to assemble it and promulgated his letters of convocation on the 19th of November, setting forth the connexion between religious and political interests in the received style of a Christian Emperor, such as had been originated under Constantine and was to be handed down to a long series of Byzantine monarchs, to such Western sovereigns as Charles the Great and Lewis the Pious, and to the Tudors and Stuarts of our own country. "We make it our special duty," says the Emperor, very much in the tone of Charles I.'s Declaration respecting the Anglican "Articles," "to have the Church in such a condition as will be worthy of God and beneficial to our reign;" and he adds, in the character of a "Supreme Governor," that he is solicitous for the blamelessness of the clergy, and "of those who discharge the high priesthood." For some time, he says, he had been thinking about a synod of the bishops "from all quarters," but now the dissensions between Churchmen make further delay impossible. Therefore the metropolitans addressed in this circular are instructed to attend, with such and so many of their suffragans as they shall deem fit, at Ephesus on the ensuing Whitsunday. The pith of the letter, so far as we can trace in it the influence of Nestorius, is contained in the words, "No new step being taken by any individual, before the assembling of the synod and its general

resolutions." Thus it was intended by Nestorius to anticipate any hostile action of Rome or Alexandria by setting in motion a power which would suspend the exercise of any authority below that of the collective episcopate: a clear proof, if proof were wanted, of the position, at that age, of even the greatest bishops in reference to an œcumenical synod. But Nestorius furthermore persuaded the Emperor to write a special letter to Cyril, severely complaining of, or rather censuring, what is described as his "subtle diplomacy" and his "mischief-making rashness," and in particular the line he had taken, "specially unbefitting a bishop," in writing to "the Augusta Pulcheria" apart from the Emperor, as if there were any divisions in the imperial family, or as if he saw his way to causing any such. This fault, however, the Emperor graciously condones, lest Cyril should say that he had been censured for upholding true religion; but he adds a warning that the coming synod's decision must be accepted, and that, with a view to its being duly made, there must be no domineering on the part of any individual: Cyril is to attend with his brother metropolitans, and to lay aside all unfriendly feeling, all excitement, all that is inconsistent with fair and patient discussion—there being, it is expressly said, no other way in which he can regain his Sovereign's favour. Such was the letter; which, as Newman has truly said, exhibited a peevish soreness of feeling towards Cyril, even a resentment against him, on grounds personal as well as public—not unnatural in such a prince placed in such a position. The tone which he takes is the best indication of the motive which now led him to summon the Council: he "flattered himself that this step would put an end to what he considered the factious clamour against" his own archbishop. And thus we see that, although Cyril persuaded himself that the general body of Asiatic prelates would side with him against Nestorius, Nestorius himself on his part was not less sanguine. About the end of November he wrote to Celestine, to the effect that Cyril was "trying, in alarm, to avoid the intended synod;" that he, for his part, did not oppose the use of Theotocos, if the idea of a fusion of natures were excluded, but that "Christotocos" had undeniably a higher warrant, and was a safeguard against opposite extremes; and that the Council would easily settle the question of terms without prejudice to the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus.

It is curious and interesting to observe the position which

Nestorius took up, when, nearly three weeks after he had got the imperial summons sent forth to the Eastern metropolitans, the long-delayed arrival of the Roman and Alexandrian ultimatum was signified to him. It was Sunday, December 7, when the four Egyptian bishops (as the seniors of them afterwards told the story) went up to the episcopal palace, where, it seems, they found the archbishop with his clergy, and almost all the men of "illustrious" rank, the highest civil dignitaries in the capital, and presented their documents to him. Nestorius bade them come the next day, and he would see them privately; but when, on the Monday, they returned, they found his door shut, and "he did not honour them with an answer." Five days passed, and nothing happened, but on the following Saturday, the 13th of December, he preached in the cathedral, beginning with a dulcet commendation of charity which had been a preceding preacher's topic, and a description of the bond of mutual dependence which linked all men, Goths, Spaniards, Africans, to each other. Then he went on to speak of the Lord of all, as having put on our nature as an "inseparable garment;" insisting that whatever Christ did, towards the living or the dead, He did with it upon Him: and he went on to denounce Paul of Samosata, who was mad enough "to think that the Manhood existed without the Godhead." He proceeded to confess One Christ—two natures, but one Only Son—in terms which of themselves were sufficiently orthodox. He apostrophized Cyril as having employed bribery and calumny, and having imitated former bishops of Alexandria in their treatment of Flavian and Meletius, Nectarius, and "John." Then he said that Theotocos was a phrase accepted by heretics, such as Apollinarians and Arians, even Eunomians: but he would make a concession; let Cyril condemn the heretical sense of Theotocos, *i.e.* the notion of a commixture of the natures, and he would accept the term in its sound sense—exactly what John of Antioch had pressed upon him. A concession, he said, of this kind was like the condescensions of St. Paul to his brethren's weakness when he became all things to all men. He goes on in effect, "If I am to say 'Theotocos' with you in a sound sense, you must say 'Anthropotocos' with me in a sound sense, and 'Christotocos,' which combines both. Do not confine yourself to 'Theotocos.' Compare me to Paul of Samosata! Why, that heretic denied the Godhead of the Son." After this, Nestorius thinks it worth while to contend against the notion of the "mutability" of the Godhead. He

referred to the text, "Christ . . . became a curse for us." Without naming John of Antioch, he gave his own explanation of the text, "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman," which John had adduced in support of Theotocos: he added that he himself had not said, "The Son is one, the Word another;" he had said, "The Word is Son by nature, and the 'Temple' by nature is another Son, made one by conjunction," distinguishing "Man" from "God"—a statement literally irreconcilable with the earlier part of this same discourse about the "sound sense" of Theotocos. The idea of mission, he added, belongs not to the Word, but to the Son, who is God the Word and man incarnate; for the Divine nature could not be "sent." He concluded by deprecating a disputatious spirit, such as the Egyptians manifested, but such as would not be allowed to have its swing in the imperial city. "No physician cures wounds by fresh wounds. For peace' sake I endure the temerity of tyranny, and do not return kick for kick. Those who say Theotocos only are deficient in what, perhaps, they will afterwards acquire; still they are members of the Church. So too are those who say Anthropotocos only: it is best to say both. Let us lay aside contentiousness; let us care only for this, that God the Word be not called a creature, nor the Manhood which was assumed be called imperfect." On the next day, Sunday, the 14th of December, after spending an unusual time in the "secretarium" or private room of the cathedral over Church business, he ascended his throne to take part in the celebration of the Eucharist, and preached a shorter sermon, at the urgent request of his clergy, to a crowded congregation. After some general remarks as to the universal utility of the knowledge of true religion, "I must spare myself," he said, "for I am weary, and you are uncomfortable from being so thickly packed together." He again used careful and fairly accurate language about the Incarnation; repeated his statement that "Christ" represented both aspects of it; accepted the term Theotocos in regard to one aspect of it, but, raising his voice as he spoke (*summa voce proclamo*, says the Latin version), insisted that it should be balanced by Anthropotocos, in order to represent both sides of the truth. If Nestorius had always spoken thus, there would indeed have been little occasion for controversy; and we are told that this sermon was greeted with loud applause, and with anathemas against any who taught otherwise. Did any in that shouting company remember Anastasius and Dorotheus?

Nestorius sent these two sermons to John, together with an answer to his letter of advice. He complained gently of any doubt being cast upon his orthodoxy, but said that he must bear this trial with cheerfulness. As to the term Theotocos, he had granted it to be permissible, when taken in a sense clear of heresy; and he begged John to give himself no uneasiness, and to look forward to a speedy meeting at the ensuing Council. "As for the presumption of the Egyptians, your Piety should not marvel at it." "I read your letter in church; it was very effective." John received these documents with satisfaction, and, on the other hand, was highly dissatisfied with the anathemas of Cyril and his synod. He wrote to Firmus, bishop of Cappadocian Casarea, saying that he doubted whether they could be Cyril's; their style was unlike his, and their tone was Apollinarian, for they made the body of Christ to be of one "nature" with the Godhead, which was to degrade the Godhead; and they contained some other novelties of expression. Firmus would do well to examine them, and condemn them in a synod. At Constantinople, John wrote, the strife was happily allayed, Nestorius having, by his advice, admitted the phrase with a sound explanation. It might seem, indeed, that Nestorius had either explained his meaning or modified his opinions, although a careful examination of his most recent language might at any rate raise a doubt whether he did not still understand the Incarnation in an unreal sense, as a very close and intimate association of two persons; whether, therefore, Theotocos, as admitted by him, was not an illusory term—as, indeed, later events showed it to be. Had the controversy been by some means closed here, Nestorius would have probably maintained his standing within the Church's lines of theological language; his confused and inconsistent phrases, even his *prima facie* heretical ones, would have received a "benign interpretation."

But Nestorius did not allow the controversy to stop here. Resentment at Cyril's proposed anathemas was too powerful with him for prudence. He imitated Cyril's tactics by meeting anathema with anathema; and his real mind was disclosed in a series of articles, extant only in a Latin version. They condemn the following statements:—

1. That Emmanuel should be called true God (or God the Word) rather than "God with us;" that Mary should be called Mother of God the Word, and not simply mother of Emmanuel;

and that the Word was turned into flesh, which He assumed by way of exhibiting His Godhead.

2. That in the "conjunction" there is a local change of the Divine essence, that it is included in flesh, that the flesh acquired a Divine infinity, and that God and Man are one in "nature."

3. That Christ, who is Emmanuel, is one, not by "conjunction," but in "nature;" whereas in fact there is an association of the Word and of the Man assumed by Him.

4. That all Scripture sayings about Christ can be referred to one "nature," and that God the Word suffered in Deity, as well as in Manhood.

5. That the Son of God is by "nature" one after the assumption of the Man.

6. That the "form of a servant" is like the Word, eternal and uncreate.

7. That the Virgin-born Man is the Only-begotten, and not rather that He shares in the title of the Only-begotten because of His being "united" to Him.

8. That the "form of a servant" is to be worshipped for its own sake, in its own nature, and not rather because of its conjunction and connexion with the true and sovereign nature of the Only-begotten.

9. That this "form" is co-essential with the Spirit, instead of being conjoined to the Word by the medium of the Spirit, and thus enabled to work miracles.

10. That the Word, and not rather Emmanuel, became the "High Priest and Apostle of our confession," instead of the properties of God being attributed to God, and those of man to the Man, in the association of the Son (of God with the Son of Mary).

11. That the flesh "united" to the Word is life-giving in its own nature; whereas our Lord says, "The flesh profiteth nothing."

12. That the Passion may be ascribed indifferently to the Word and to the flesh, without distinguishing between the respective dignities of the natures.

Nestorius took nothing, or very little, by these anathemas. They were confusedly and awkwardly written. Some of them were certainly negations of errors which had existed, and might still exist, or revive; but in others his incurable habit of regarding the Word and the Man as two beings distinctly showed itself, and proved that his acceptance of Theotocos, reluctant as it was,

had also been unreal—as unreal as his way of using the term “united” when he only meant “combined.” We must, of course, admit the difficulty, in this controversy, of finding language precisely balanced—of so stating the Personal Oneness as not to merge Manhood into Godhead, of so stating the distinctness of Manhood without virtually “dividing” the Christ. But we can hardly accept this as an excuse for such parts of this unhappy prelate’s language as practically determined the Church’s judgment against him. He was, we must regretfully admit, a disciple, if not always a consistent disciple, of Theodore.

Marius Mercator, indefatigably zealous against different forms of error, drew up a pamphlet in which the anathemas of Cyril were compared with those of Nestorius, and the “wicked” sayings of the latter were “contradicted,” in paragraphs, by “a Catholic.” It is to this document that we owe our knowledge, in a Latin version, of the Nestorian anathemas; and perhaps their obscurity of language may be due to some faults in the translation. Mercator remarks on the incoherence of thought which he finds in Nestorius, but affirms that he “never really departs from his wicked intention of bringing in one person who should be regarded as by nature Son of God, and another conjoined to Him by association, who should be *called* Son, and God, but should not be naturally and really God.” In some passages—says Mercator, with obvious truth—Nestorius is fighting a shadow, and contradicting what no one would think of asserting, *i.e.* that the Godhead could suffer anything. He illustrates Nestorius’s meaning by quotations from his discourses; and severely criticizes his argument from the Nicene Council’s silence about Theotocos, remarking that the Nicene Creed unequivocally identifies Jesus with the co-essential and Only-begotten Son of God—which, of course, was the heart of the whole matter.

So the year 430 came to a close, amid the excitements of an interrupted controversy and the preparations for a Council on the grand scale, resembling that of Nicæa. For in this matter, as in others, the theory of a united empire was preserved, the Western Emperor’s name being united with that of the Eastern; and Theodosius showed his appreciation of the importance of the African Church by sending an invitation to its hierarchy, and by expressly addressing his letter to that one bishop of a second-rate seaside town who had for so long been its great ornament, its most honoured teacher, and indeed the theological oracle of

Western Christendom. But it was too late. Though not yet known to the court of Constantinople, an event had already happened which was to make the Vandal siege of Hippo for ever memorable: that event was the death of St. Augustine.

It was now more than a year since the unhappy breach of Boniface, "Count" of Africa, with his own government, and his yet more unhappy correspondence with the Vandals of Spain, extenuated as it may be by the intrigues of his rival Aetius, had precipitated the ruin of "seven fruitful provinces." Augustine had already remonstrated with Boniface, whom he respected and loved, as to his negligence in the guardianship of the Roman territory against "African barbarians." But now a more formidable body of barbarians, "who in twenty years had penetrated from the Elbe to Mount Atlas," had assembled in force on the other side of the Straits of Gibraltar, and prepared to swoop down upon the prey which they expected to find in the great African settlement where "Roman art and magnificence" had raised so many trophies, and where a long sunshine of prosperity had so enervated and corrupted a dense population, that Salvian could describe "Africa," and yet more Carthage itself, as "a sink" of all the vices, and peculiarly given to sensuality and even to "blasphemy" and heathenish proclivities. Granting all that might be said of an exaggerative tone in this earnest writer's scathing denunciations, it remains a matter of sad reflection that a people on whom religious influences had so long been at work, who had seen so many ecclesiastical councils, and been tended by so many saintly pastors, should have been morally no better fitted to stand the fiery trial when it came. The invasion took place in the May of 429; and the Vandal king, whose name of Gaiseric was to be so terrible, and in whom reserve and craft were combined with moods of stormy passion, led over fifty thousand soldiers into Africa. Thus began that stern and strong dominion of a barbaric race and a heretical creed—for the Vandals, like the Goths, were Arians, and, although temperate, were pitilessly hard—a dominion which was destined to hold the African provinces for somewhat more than a century, and then to fall before the energy of Belisarius.

Augustine was in his seventy-fifth year when the troubles that thickened with the Vandal invasion compelled him to leave unfinished his work against Julian. He executed a task which grew out of a conference with an Arian bishop named Maximin, who

had accompanied the Gothic auxiliaries of the Western empire; and we find some of the clearest and tersest specimens of Latin Trinitarian argument in the two books which Augustine drew up "against Maximin." Another work of his last days was the short treatise upon Heresies, necessarily incomplete, as he himself felt, and yet full enough of information, gathered in great part from the Latin translation of Eusebius which had been executed, years before, by Rufinus. He laboured to bring back Boniface to his duty; and that credulous victim of a court intrigue became convinced that he had been duped respecting the intentions of the government towards him on the one hand, and that Placidia had been duped respecting him on the other. This conviction was produced by an interview between the revolted count and a high officer of the empire named Darius, who received about the same time a cordial letter from Augustine, and replied in terms of fervent respectful affection. Darius sent, also, by a priest some remedies which his physician thought likely to be useful for the maladies of the aged bishop.

But the return of Boniface to his loyalty came too late. He was defeated by the Vandals and threw himself into Hippo. They besieged it. Augustine, who had written to a bishop named Honoratus that chief pastors ought not to quit their flocks, except there were other ministers left to supply their place whose lives were not similarly sought for, had with him several bishops, and among other friends his biographer Possidius, who tells how the great teacher, whose mind had so often revolved the mysteries of the Divine providence, was fain, in this supreme trial of faith and patience, to repeat the words that afterwards consoled an Emperor in the anguish of his downfall, "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, and true are Thy judgments." He kept on praying—and his friends and fellow-citizens with him—"that God would either deliver Hippo, or at least would strengthen His servants to bear His will, or would remove Augustine from a world so full of misery." The siege had begun in June 430: in August, Augustine was smitten with fever, and saw that the latter part of his prayer was about to be heard. It had been a saying of his that "the most approved Christians and priests ought not to die without a fitting and sufficient course of penitence;" and acting on this principle, he caused "those few psalms of David which treat of penitence to be written out in leaves, and placed against the wall opposite to his bed, and so he used to read, and weep abundantly." What

a picture it is!—the aged saint, at whose feet, as it were, the whole Church had sat listening as to the voice of an angel, now in his old age and in his last illness, pent up in a besieged city which might expect the extremities of Vandal cruelty, musing by times, with many a reference to his favourite text, “O altitudo!” on the awful inscrutable judgments, the ways past finding out, which had brought this crushing storm upon his people and his Church, and had apparently ruined the Catholic cause in a land where it had long been triumphant; then calling up in a retrospect the forty-four years which had elapsed since his conversion, their manifold anxieties and labours, all to end, as it might appear, in a death which to the world would seem so dreary—all *not* to end, as his faith told him, so far as they had been undergone and performed according to the good Will that preordained them; then entering more deeply into himself, gazing at the “Miserere” and the “De profundis,” as if they were the interpreters of his inmost soul. About the 18th of that sad August, all visitors were excluded except at the hours for food and medicine: on the 28th, retaining all his faculties to the last, he passed away in the presence of loving and loyal friends, who stood by and prayed with him, and presently took part in the Eucharistic sacrifice which accompanied his burial, as he had taken part in it on the occasion of his mother’s. Never, surely, never, in spite of exaggerations and impetuosities in his habit of thought, had the Faith of Christ a truer or worthier votary. Never was there a man who more genuinely carried out his belief into his life; never a pastor or prelate who lived more habitually in the felt presence of the Supreme Shepherd; never a theologian who, amid all his abstract speculations, or while plunging into metaphysical depths, kept before him more tenaciously, more enthusiastically, that great thought which is the salt of theological study, the thought of a Living God personally self-revealed; never, finally, a preacher or guide of souls who could help his brethren with a richer experience, a tenderer or more effective sympathy, a keener remembrance of all the “way” by which he had himself been “led,” a more affectionate solicitous earnestness to bring them whither he himself had been brought, so as to find rest for heart and soul in the service of Him who, in his own penetrating words, had “made them for Himself:” “Fecisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te.” We may, to some extent, appreciate the humble wish of the laborious Tillemont, at the end of his thick volume on

St. Augustine, "that He who could do everything would raise up and inspire some one to make a true portrait not of the outward actions, but of the mind and the virtue of this great Saint, in order to make us see whatever is greatest and holiest in the Gospel illustrated in his works and practised in his conduct." Most appropriate was the selection made in the Parisian Breviary of an antiphon at Magnificat on the eve of his festival, "Gratia Dei sum id quod sum, et gratia ejus in me vacua non fuit."

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE COUNCIL OF EPHESUS.—PART I.

WE must now return to the Nestorian controversy, and observe how, in the opening of 431, Cyril's want of due consideration in the framing of his twelve anathemas had alienated some to whom he had looked for support, and given no small practical encouragement to the advocates of the teaching which he condemned. John of Antioch, as we have seen, was seriously offended by the anathemas as a whole, although there is no reason to doubt that he would have acquiesced in the doctrine of the letter to which they had been appended. "He thought," says Liberatus, archdeacon of Carthage in the next century, "that Cyril, while immediately opposing Nestorius, had fallen into the heresy of Apollinaris." Under this impression—an erroneous one, but, considering some words in the anathemas, especially in the third and the twelfth, not inexcusable—the patriarch of Antioch "commissioned two of the most learned bishops" under his jurisdiction to answer the Cyrilline anathemas. The first of these was Andrew of Samosata, who appears, from a letter of Theodoret's, to have been personally a very amiable and modest man; he wrote a treatise in the name of the "Oriental," that is, the Syrian and Mesopotamian, Churches, but forbore to mention the name of Cyril. Its character is apparent from the extracts commented upon by Cyril in a reply which he made, called "A Defence of the Twelve Chapters" (or "Articles") "against the Orientals." Although Andrew did not criticize all the Articles, some of the objections made by him appear very captious. "If," he asks, "the union be 'natural,' where is the grace, where the Divine mystery?" Again, Cyril had insisted that the Scripture sayings about Christ ought not to be assigned to two individual beings: Andrew could not see how this fell short of confounding the Manhood with the Godhead. He also imagined that when

Cyril spoke of the Word as High Priest, he meant that He was so in His Godhead; and that when he spoke of the flesh of Christ as the Word's "own flesh," he meant that it was not taken from our nature. There was thus an evident misconception of Cyril's standpoint: Andrew was arguing against what Cyril did not maintain, and was essentially at one with him in belief. For instance, he says, "We confess one and the same Son, the natures remaining unconfused;" and Cyril accepts another statement as excluding all "division" of the Divine Son's single personality.

The other writer whose pen was enlisted by John of Antioch might be considered a more important adversary, being one of the very best, most learned, most hard-working bishops to be found in Christendom. Theodoret of Cyrrhos had read the Twelve Articles with great vexation; he wrote to John that they were a revival of the extinct absurdities and impieties of Apollinaris, and sent him the desired treatise in reply. In parts of this work Theodoret used Nestorian language, or at least what would then be understood to mean what Nestorius meant—speaking of a "man" as "assumed" by the Word, and of that "man" as "God-bearing," *Theophoros* (a phrase for which he appealed mistakenly to St. Basil), and as inseparably "connected" with the Word, and sometimes arguing as if a human nature in Christ involves a distinct human personality. But, on the whole, it appears that if Apollinarianism were unequivocally disclaimed, and if the distinction of the Divine and human natures were recognised, to the exclusion of all notion of "commixture," such as "natural" or "hypostatic" union seemed to him to involve, Theodoret would be satisfied; he not only owns the unity of the Christ, and calls him God and Man, but explains the sense of "man being assumed" as equivalent to "manhood being assumed," using the neuter, more than once, for that which was thus assumed. Theodoret wrote with much polemical keenness, and Cyril, in his rejoinder, fully paid it back. We see something of the arrogance of an Alexandrian "Pope"—of such arrogance as Socrates ascribes to them—in the sneer which, when addressing a prefatory letter to bishop Euoptyus, who had sent him Theodoret's work, he levels at Theodoret's "little town, which, they tell me, is called Cyros." Altogether Cyril's blood was up, and he writes as one who cared not to conceal his wrath; he affirms that his opponent, although "said to be a well-read person and perhaps above the average in Scriptural knowledge," has wholly failed to grasp the meaning of his "articles," easy as it

was to understand them all. A gentler and calmer nature would probably have seen that in effect Theodoret was at one with him in belief. But Cyril does explain himself on some points, to the effect that by "natural" union he meant a union which was "real," not relative or accidental; that Christ took on Himself "the properties of the manhood," and that what he had intended to exclude in the seventh and ninth articles was the notion that the Divine operation on Christ as man was such as takes place on merely human saints. Of course, he says, the Word could not suffer as God; but the flesh which suffered was His, and only as thus attributable to Him could its sufferings have any redemptive virtue.

A third work, undertaken in the spring of 431 by Cyril, was a "Reply," in five books, "to the blasphemies of Nestorius," that is, to his sermons against Proclus. In this treatise he quotes from Nestorius, and then comments on each passage quoted. He disclaims all notion of "confusion," and acknowledges a true human soul as present in Jesus, but enforces the necessity of the term Theotocos (which in those sermons Nestorius had grudgingly admitted to be permissible, if used in a guarded sense), and shows that it does not mean "parent of the Godhead." He controverts the inadequate interpretation which Nestorius had put upon the Nicene Creed and on the words of Scripture; remarks that he had not only argued against "Theotocos," but had otherwise reduced the Incarnation to an association of a man with God—an association relative and external; asserts that after the "union" there was "one incarnate *nature*," but in the same context explains that phrase (which was afterwards to give trouble enough) as meaning one Christ, in whom Godhead and manhood, "essentially different" from each other, concurred with each other under one *personality*. He also exposes the futile sense in which Nestorius would have applied the term "God" to the individual human person whom he called Christ; insists that he could not, on his theory, exclude the notion of two Sons; and by all forms of argument or illustration labours to place before the reader the question really at stake, Had God the Son Himself become incarnate, or had He only conjoined Himself to a man, who existed "individually" and "apart"? To this point, after all, the whole debate reduced itself. Nestorius, as Cyril felt and said, had never cleared himself from the notion of a mere "conjunction;" therefore, whatever high titles he might award to the

man "conjoined," that man was, for him, a human Saviour, and nothing more; whereas the revealed plan of salvation, of reconciliation of heaven and earth, of reunion of mankind with God, presupposed a Saviour Divine in His personality, as well as human in the nature which He stooped to assume—One who, being God-Man, could lay His hand on God and man, and be in His single self a true Redeemer. To this point, then, it is that Cyril brings everything; to this, amid all the prolixity and iteration which the call for "explanation" made requisite, he clings resolutely and immovably; and he forces the reader to see that this is no verbal question at all, but a question between two versions of Christian teaching, or rather between two creeds, each standing on its separate basis. How far Nestorius realised this is another matter, on which we cannot judge.

According to certain Coptic documents, which are not supported by Greek authorities, Cyril secured the assistance at court of a Constantinopolitan abbot named Victor, who accordingly used influence with Theodosius to prevent any postponement at Ephesus of the dogmatic question.

And now, about Easter, Cyril wrote again to Celestine, to ask what should be done at the coming Council if Nestorius were to retract: was the retractation to be accepted, or was he to be dealt with as self-condemned because he had let the prescribed "ten days" pass? The question may seem a strange one, for the summoning of the Council would be held to suspend the process begun by inferior authorities; and to obey this summoning was implicitly to accept this result, however unwilling Cyril might be to do so. Moreover, Celestine's instructions had already been fulfilled; his commission, so to call it, had been exhausted. Celestine, however, was not at the time indisposed to regard it as still somehow operative; and he answered by referring to the Divine readiness to accept all repentance, however tardy. He did not choose to travel to Ephesus, but commissioned two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, and a priest named Philip, to represent him; giving them a letter for the Council, of which more further on, and a memorandum of instructions to this purport: "When you reach Ephesus, consult Cyril, and do whatever he thinks good. The authority of the apostolic see must be preserved; you ought to judge of the opinions of those who discuss, not yourselves enter into a contest. If you find that the Council is over, ask how it has ended. If all went well with the faith, and Cyril is found to

have gone to Constantinople, go thither too, and present my letter to Theodosius. If the Council has not ended, judge from the circumstances, with Cyril's advice, how to act." This is dated on the 8th of May, nearly three weeks after Easter. Nestorius had then already started on his journey to Ephesus, accompanied by Count Candidian, captain of the Emperor's guards, who was to act as the imperial representative at the Council, and by Count Irenæus, as a personal friend; he had also with him ten bishops. Cyril took with him fifty bishops, about half the number of his suffragans; and, on reaching Rhodes, sent a letter to his clergy and people, expressing his thankfulness for a quiet and prosperous voyage, with "gentle winds on the great and wide sea," and his hope that the storms of the present crisis would also be allayed by Almighty power. He exhorted them to pray for him, and to persevere in conduct worthy of their profession. He reached Ephesus after the arrival of Nestorius, and by Coptic accounts on the very eve of Pentecost, which was the time appointed for the opening of the Council and fell on the 7th of June. On his arrival he wrote again to his clergy and people, announcing that "through their prayers he had reached Ephesus in good health, and was hopeful that the result of the Council now at hand would be the extirpation of all perverse notions from the Churches," but that "the evil one, the sleepless wild beast," meaning Satan, "was laying plots against Christ's glory." He asked them to pray that they might meet again in mutual gladness; for all things were possible to God. According to the Coptic documents, Cyril saw reason for defending himself against the charge of having brought "parabolani" to intimidate his opponents, and stores of corn to buy over the poorer bishops—resources which he was not thought likely to disregard.

It was found impossible to begin the Council on Whitsunday. The prelates of the Antiochene patriarchate could not arrive so soon, even if they all started from their Churches after Low Sunday, or, as the Easterns called it, New Sunday; and they could not be expected to start before that day, on account of the Easter octave and the ceremonies relating to the new-baptized. The other bishops were assembling already. Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, and exarch or primate of "Asia," had gathered round him several eminent metropolitans who presided over the Churches of Lycaonia, Pamphylia, Hellespont, and Caria. Five days after Whitsunday, Juvenal of Jerusalem appeared with the bishops of Palestine, and with a bishop whom he had consecrated for the Saracens.

Theodotus of Ancyra, Acacius of Melitene, Firmus the exarch of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Rheginus of Constantia in Cyprus, Flavian of Philippi—who held a proxy for Rufus of Thessalonica, detained by illness—are also to be mentioned; Crete was represented by the metropolitan of Gortyna; Perigenes of Corinth could speak for Greece. Some Thracian bishops were there, and one from Epirus; and there was one figure on which the eyes of all the Eastern or Greek prelates would be rivetted—a solitary deacon named Besulas, or Vesulas, who, after a long and dangerous journey, had made good his appearance as the representative of the once glorious Church of Africa. Capreolus, the metropolitan of Carthage, had acted on the letter of invitation, which came several months too late to be delivered to Augustine. He would fain have summoned a Council to choose representatives who should go to Ephesus; but the miseries of Africa rendered this impossible. The Vandals were sweeping in devastating force over the land; the inhabitants of wide districts had been either slain or compelled to fly. The roads were stopped up, there was no safe travelling, and the interval after the arrival of the invitation, which only came to hand at Easter, had been too short to allow of any deliberative gathering, had it been otherwise feasible. Capreolus, therefore, could only send his deacon Besulas, with a letter in which, after describing his own circumstances, he entreated his brethren, met for the Council, to uphold the ancient faith, and to condemn the new doctrines previously unknown to the ears of “Churchmen.”

While they were waiting for the “Orientals,” the bishops discussed the doctrinal question among themselves, and not as a synod. Cyril made some fresh extracts from the writings of Nestorius, “wishing,” says Liberatus, “to perturb him, for, as it is said, he was his enemy.” Socrates describes him as “engaged in sharp skirmishes of words” for the same purpose. His friend Memnon is said to have hindered Nestorius and his adherents from celebrating the Whitsuntide festival or entering “the most holy basilica of the apostle John;” and the latter further complained of something like organized terrorism, of soldiers besetting their houses and threatening them with violence of the worst kind. It is to be feared that neither Cyril nor Memnon (who was afterwards accused of having used violence to a man by way of compelling him to accept the episcopate!) was likely to be very scrupulous as to the means to be taken for harassing a “heretic;” and Nestorius in their eyes was but a

heretic, although the general body of the bishops still treated him as a prelate in their communion, according to the idea of the imperial letter convoking the synod. This latter consideration would of itself have prevented Cyril from publicly using such language against Nestorius as is attributed to him in a sermon called the "Encomium of Cyril on St. Mary the Theotocos." This discourse, moreover, contains a long string of "Hail Maries," and a reference to Celestine as "archbishop of the whole world"—language which betokens the hand of a later inventor. We may reasonably set it aside as spurious: but another discourse, described in its heading as very beautiful, is obviously genuine, and contains a careful disclaimer of "the insane heresy of Apollinaris." It apostrophizes Nestorius, but in gentle terms. "Accept, O man, the spiritual daystar; cease to fight against Christ: He cannot be defeated; He always, and by all means, gains the victory."

The "illustrious" Armenian bishop, Acacius of Melitene, deserves a special mention: a personal friend of Nestorius, he laboured to win him over to orthodoxy: from the moment of his arrival at Ephesus, he devoted himself to this unhopeful enterprise, and "thought he had got him, at least in words, to retract." But when, after some ten or twelve days, they renewed their conversation, Acacius, as he himself tells the story, found Nestorius to be really "opposed to the true doctrine," and to have taken up a dilemma which seemed to him conclusive. "Either you, Acacius, deny that the Godhead of the Son was incarnate, and if so, you agree with me; or you must maintain that the Godhead of the Father and of the Spirit was incarnate also"—which was an undue straining of the principle of the Divine Coinherence, for it is the One Godhead as existing in the Son to which the Incarnation is referred. In another conference, a bishop who was with Nestorius excused the Jews for murdering Christ by saying that the crime was committed, not against God, but against "a man;" and another prelate said expressly that the Son who suffered was one person, and God the Word was another. "I could not," said Acacius, "endure this blasphemy; so I took leave of them, and departed." Theodotus of Ancyra heard Nestorius say in the presence of many others, "To call a child of two or three months old God" (meaning, evidently, "to say that He was actually, not merely titularly, God") "is, I hold, unlawful." This was the saying which, beyond all others ascribed to Nestorius, impressed his adversaries with the conviction

that he was, not verbally but essentially, opposed to them in belief. He might have accepted the term "Theotocos" with caveats or qualifications; but what was the worth of such acceptance, when he thus definitely and pointedly denied the Son of Mary to be in truth Divine? For if the Infant when born at Bethlehem or carried into Egypt was not to be called God, neither was the Man who hung on the cross or rose again from the sepulchre, the personality being identical. The negation was absolute, unequivocal, decisive; and it was repeatedly quoted in the course of the subsequent proceedings, as closing all questions as to the alienation of Nestorius from the belief of the Church in a truly Divine Redeemer. He had said that the Son of Mary could not be called God; this was enough—it left no room for parley or explanation. And Nestorius, instead of recalling, or even attempting to modify, the saying, appears to have amplified his expressions by declaring that he could not worship a Child that had been suckled, and had been carried into Egypt, even adding that "he was clear of the blood of those who were opposed to him on this matter, and that he would in future avoid all conference with them." It was afterwards that he tried to explain away his language as not intended to convey his own deliberate mind.

His friends were aware that "the Egyptians," as they called them, were impatient of the delay caused by the non-arrival of the Orientals; for several days had now elapsed from June 7th, the day named by Theodosius for the opening of the Council. We are told that several of the bishops in Ephesus were seriously inconvenienced by the increased expense of a stay so much longer than they had anticipated: some had fallen ill, a few had actually died; and Cyril and his friends persuaded themselves that they might reasonably suspect John of Antioch to be pursuing a Fabian policy and artificially protracting his journey in order to gain time for Nestorius; but of this there was no sufficient evidence, or rather the suspicion was hasty and inconsiderate. John could not have better served the cause of Nestorius than by hurrying with all speed to the scene of action, and he really seems to have made good use of the time available for his journey. His colleagues, as we have seen, could not leave their own dioceses before the end of the Easter octave, that is, before April 27th; some of them, as Evagrius says, were distant more than ten days' journey from Antioch, and at Antioch there was a further hindrance caused

by popular disturbances. At last, on the 18th of May, John left Antioch, and, as he said, travelled forty days continuously, to the great inconvenience of some of his episcopal fellow-travellers: it is added that some horses died of the fatigue. The journey would occupy thirty days for a single vigorous traveller: but, in the circumstances, we can hardly wonder that it took up a longer time. After thirty days John wrote to Cyril a verbally cordial and affectionate letter, expressing profound regret that he was "a few days" behind time. We need not take literally the Asiatic courtesy which assured Cyril that he experienced the greatest possible desire "to see him, and to embrace his sacred head:" this he hoped to do in five or six days more. Some officials were sent on—it must have been by a forced march indeed—to carry this letter: they must have arrived at latest on Sunday, the 21st of June. This was a critical day, the fifteenth from the 7th of June inclusive. Cyril, probably, had already written to John, to say that the Council, that is, the bishops, were waiting for him. Two metropolitans of John's party now arrived—Alexander of Apamea, and another Alexander of Hierapolis, who was to be one of the most stubborn and persistent supporters of the Nestorian cause. We are assured that, when complaint was made to these two bishops about John's delay, they answered, "He bade us tell your Piety, that if he still should happen to tarry, you were no longer to wait for him," which in all fairness must be understood to mean, "if he should not arrive by the time which his letter had specified"—a condition to be carefully kept in mind. But the bishops of the Cyrilline party, if we are so to call it, were resolved to wait no longer, but to meet and open the Council on the morrow, Monday the 22nd. Nestorius and his friends naturally objected to this, and proposed a delay of four days longer; and when this was rejected, proposed again to abide by the decision of Count Candidian, who, having ascertained by means of couriers that John and his friends were really at hand, ordered all the prelates, in the Emperor's name, to wait for the Orientals' arrival. Now came the question for Cyril. If he refused to comply, what ground could he take? The theory of "loitering" was disproved, and the plea that to wait for the Orientals would involve a Nestorian victory was still more untenable, for Cyril would in any case have a large majority—he had over 150 bishops on his side: and if only he had had such patience and such faith in his own cause as might have been fairly expected of him, he would

have advised his supporters to comply with the commissioner's monition. He might have said, "Well, we will give no occasion for a charge of hasty unfairness; we will wait these few days more, and when John arrives, let God defend His own truth!" He would then have taken up a noble position, and gained beforehand a moral triumph for his cause. What was the worst he had to apprehend? Some demand for a revision of the anathemas; and this might have saved all the trouble and discord which was with difficulty healed, and even then not completely, at the Reunion of 432-3. But, most unhappily, he was still sore at having to take the case through a Council at all, and bent on getting Nestorius condemned out of hand, and on precluding all question about his own anathemas; and so, on that Sunday afternoon, he took a resolution which was the cause, as Facundus afterwards said, "*totius discidii*" and "*omnis tumultus*," while it gave a new proof of his vehemence and imprudence.

That same evening four bishops carried a summons, or intimation, to Nestorius, "You will be required to appear in the Council to-morrow." "I will consider of it," he answered, "and will come if I find it necessary to do so." Six or seven other bishops who were with him were similarly cited, and answered similarly, "We will consider, and if we think fit, we will come to-morrow." Sixty-eight prelates of the Nestorian party (some of whom, however, went over afterwards to the majority) drew up a protest, addressed to Cyril and Juvenal, against opening the Council before the arrival of John and of certain Western bishops, meaning the legates of the bishop of Rome. When, on the Monday morning, Cyril and the others were assembled in St. Mary's church—which the Acts call "St. Mary," much as the cathedral of Paris is called simply "Notre Dame"—Candidian hastened thither, and positively assured them that it was the Emperor's will that they should wait for all their brethren, and not hold a synod by themselves. "Let us hear," they asked, "the Emperor's orders read." "No, I cannot read a letter intended for the Council until all the members of the Council are met." "But how can we be sure of the Emperor's mind unless we hear his letter?" Thereupon Candidian, without losing his temper at this implicit accusation, consented to read what he describes, in the heathenish style still retained by the Christian from the old pagan court, as the "divine and adorable" letter, and from which it appeared that *his* functions were limited to the exclusion of all unqualified persons from the synod, and to the

maintenance of quiet and order during its sessions. He was "to take no part whatever in doctrinal discussions; for it was unlawful that one who was not enrolled among bishops should mix himself up with investigations properly ecclesiastical." But he was to see that no dissension should arise, whereby full discussion might be hindered; and thus to promote the attainment, "without disturbance," of a decision representing "the common judgment of all." No other question was to take precedence of the dogmatic one, and no question of a pecuniary or criminal kind was to be entertained at all. The imperial letter did not alter the purpose of the bishops; and Candidian, finding them resolute, asked for only four days' delay. "Again and again," he said afterwards, "I urged this, I even entreated you to grant it, but I gained nothing." They insisted that he should leave the church, and he at last did so, but only to draw up a protest, to publish it in Ephesus together with the Emperor's letter of citation, and to forward it to the Emperor.

Left to themselves, the bishops opened the Council. They sat, apparently, on a double line of seats on each side of the church; in the midst, upon a throne, they placed the book of the Gospels, "to represent the presence of Christ Himself." A hundred and fifty-eight prelates were present, besides Besulas, the deacon-legate from Carthage. Cyril presided, partly, it appears, as the highest prelate in point of rank, and also as "managing the place," or, as we should say, as virtually holding the proxy, of Celestine of Rome. Now we have already observed that the commission given by Celestine to Cyril, "Attach the authority of our see to yourself, and act as in our place," could not possibly have been given with a view to this day's proceedings; for Celestine wrote thus in the preceding August, before any General Council was thought of, and was simply empowering Cyril to act for him as well as for himself in the final admonition—as it was then designed—to be despatched to the bishop of Constantinople. All that could be said by way of connecting Cyril's presidency at Ephesus with Celestine's words in the letter just quoted was, in Tillemont's language, that "Cyril might well suppose that Celestine would not disavow him, if he professed to be acting in his name." Scruples as to presiding in a case which, as far as he could do so, he had already prejudged, and in which he was himself an accused person—accused by Nestorius—were not likely to occur to the fiery and high-handed Alexandrian, who too often throughout these disputes illustrates the evil which

may be done to a good cause by that want of scruple as to methods which becomes too surely a "rock of offence." Juvenal of Jerusalem, in the absence of John of Antioch, claimed and secured the second place; then came Memnon, then Flavian of Philippi, who also—it is very nearly the same phrase as is used of Cyril and Celestine—"was holding the place of Rufus of Thessalonica;" then Theodotus of Ancyra, Firmus of Cappadocian Cæsarea, Acacius of Melitene.

The proceedings began with a short statement of the events which had led up to the Council. This was given by Peter, a priest of Alexandria and chief secretary to the Council. The letter of citation from the Emperor to the metropolitans was then read. At the request of Firmus, Memnon declared that sixteen days had elapsed from the day named by the Emperor. The remonstrances made to the bishops by the imperial commissioner were disingenuously suppressed; but the imperial letter addressed to them, and recently read by him, was referred to as having been read, and Cyril actually had the face to quote it as having ordered them to proceed "without any delay," whereas the words had been "without any disturbance," and all that the Emperor had said as to time was that the doctrinal question should come first. Cyril's impetuosity was checked by Theodotus, who said, "The next step is to obtain the presence of Nestorius at our proceedings." The bishops who had been sent to ask Nestorius to attend then stated the result of their mission; it was resolved to send three other bishops and a secretary with a letter respectfully asking him no longer to defer his coming. The deputies went to his lodgings, and sent in their message, although with some difficulty, the door being guarded by sentries with sticks, who said that "he was taking some rest, and that he had ordered that no one should disturb him." At last a reply arrived to the effect that Nestorius would come when all the bishops were assembled. On the motion of the bishop of Philippi a third citation was committed to the care of four bishops with a secretary. Nestorius was requested, late as it was, to attend and clear himself of the heretical doctrines which he was said to have promulgated in full church: if he failed to attend this time, the Council would be obliged to proceed against him, according to the canons of the holy fathers. For some time—it was now midday—the deputies were kept waiting under the June sun. They tried to stand in a cool place in the shade, but the soldiers rudely thrust them off. "We are," they said, "four bishops, sent

not to treat him with insult, but simply, and in a regular way, to request his presence in the holy Council." It was in vain; the guards would allow no message to pass: Nestorius had expressly refused, they said, to see any deputy from the Council. "If you stand in this porch until evening, you will get no other answer." The deputies, upon this, gave up their task; and the Council, on hearing their report, gave up the attempt to obtain the presence of him whom, with commendable formality, they still called "the most pious Nestorius."

What should be their next step? Either they considered Celestine's judgment as final, as absolutely determining their own view of the situation, or they did not. If they did, they had but one thing to do—to ascertain whether Nestorius had made the recantation which Celestine, and Cyril acting on Celestine's behalf, had required. A few minutes would have sufficed for this. But instead of proceeding thus summarily, and then acting ministerially as the obedient organs of a papal sentence, they spent a long midsummer day in an examination of the whole case on its merits. And first, on Juvenal's motion, the Nicene Creed, as originally framed—not in the form commonly called Constantinopolitan, which the Church of Alexandria did not recognise—was solemnly recited, as the synodical confession and test of faith. Then was read Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, which began, "I hear that some are babbling about my character." Cyril then said, "I think that in my letter, just read, I have in no wise deviated from the exposition of the Nicene doctrine. I beg your Holinesses to say whether or not I have written rightly and irreproachably, and in accordance with that holy synod." Then began a long series of solemn testimonies in favour of this letter. Bishop after bishop, beginning with Juvenal, arose, and declared that in his judgment the letter was orthodox and conformable to the Nicene standard. It is of great importance to observe that here the Council was sitting, as it were, in judgment upon Cyril's letter, and pronouncing it to stand the test by which it had been tried, whereas it had already obtained the full assent of the Roman bishop. The prelates speak in the same sense, although with a good deal of variety in their phrases. "The letter is in harmony with the Nicene Creed." "I find it to harmonize, and to throw great light on the true meaning of the Nicene Creed; therefore I assent to it as being thus fully orthodox." "I recognise the agreement between the letter and the Creed, and I

assent to our father Cyril, as I do to the 318." "Since I see the letter to be filled with all piety, and all agreement with the 318 fathers, I accept it." "Finding it to differ only in words from the Nicene Creed, not at all in substance, I profess that this is the faith in which I was baptized, and pray that I may preserve it for Christ my Master." "I find that the letter diffuses the Nicene fathers' faith, like a sweet ointment." "I assent to the letter as agreeable to the Nicene Creed, and as well and piously worded." "I admire it as agreeable to the Nicene Creed." "It is an exposition of the Nicene Creed." "The letter and the creed have the same meaning, although they differ in words." "The same faith has been more lucidly explained by Cyril's letter." All the bishops who spoke—and the Acts give 125 speeches—evidently meant to say the same thing, although they did not all refer verbally to the Nicene Creed, but in some cases were content to adhere to what others had said upon the subject. This, then, is clear, that Cyril's letter was not simply accepted because Celestine had approved it, but was submitted afresh to the Council, and then adjudged by it, as by the highest authority in the Church, to be orthodox *because* virtually Nicene. The Council felt, as it afterwards told Theodosius, that it was "under the necessity" of discussing the question of doctrine; and it regarded itself as "establishing the right definition of the faith" by comparing Cyril's teaching with the Creed as a standard.

The next document read was Nestorius's answer, beginning, "The insulting remarks in your marvellous letter I pass by." It will be remembered that in this letter Nestorius had charged Cyril with practically cancelling his own admissions of a distinction between Godhead and manhood, and of the impassibility of Godhead; and had maintained that, in regard to the birth of Christ, Theotocos was not so exact a term as Christotocos, and that, although the Godhead might be said to "appropriate" human conditions, to ascribe birth to "God" was in effect Apollinarian. Cyril again asked, "What the holy and great Council thought of the letter just read? Was it"—one can imagine the triumphant scorn in his eyes and tone as he spoke—"was *it*, also, agreeable to the creed defined by the holy Council of Nicæa, or was it not?" Again arose the episcopal voices, one after another; but this time it was to brand and condemn. "It is in no sort of way in accordance with the faith of Nicæa." "It is wholly at variance with that faith." "It agrees neither with the creed nor with Cyril's

letter." "It is full of blasphemy." "It has a show of piety at the outset, but as it advances it contradicts the faith." "Nestorius has set forth" (he is called in the same breath "the most pious Nestorius") "a spurious faith." "I anathematize those who think as he does." Acacius spoke at some length, declaring that Nestorius was warranted in his fear of attending the Council; after having written a letter so unscriptural and heterodox, he might well set soldiers to guard his doors. He falsely accuses Cyril, proceeded Acacius, of saying that God is passible—which Cyril never thought of; and he himself, recognising as far as words go the union of God with the flesh, is proved to deny it in fact. And so the stream of denunciation took its course, and broadened at last into a mass of anathemas against Nestorius, against his impious belief, his letter, his dogmas, whosoever communicated with him, whosoever did not anathematize him. Amid the tumult of voices Juvenal's was heard, calmly bidding the secretary to read "the letter of the most holy bishop of Rome"—Celestine's letter to Nestorius; after which was read the third or synodical letter of Cyril to Nestorius, the letter written in discharge of Celestine's commission, and to which were appended the chapters, articles, or anathemas, already described. It is observable that not a word is recorded in the Acts as having been uttered by way of comment on this letter; clearly because, to many then present, the anathemas presented a serious difficulty. But the bishops who had carried it to Constantinople were made to tell the story of their proceedings; after which the bishop of Joppa requested that Theodotus and Acacius would inform the Council as to their recent experiences of Nestorius's present state of mind. After they had done so, a number of extracts from approved Church teachers, including Athanasius, Theophilus of Alexandria, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Amphilochius, were read in order. Of these writers two or three were the more apposite, because they had taken an active part against that Apollinarian heresy which Cyril was wrongly accused of attempting to revive. Ambrose, like Cyprian, was quoted as identifying the Divine and Eternal Son with the Virgin-born Redeemer; Gregory's anathema against any one who denied the Virgin to be Theotocos—an anathema directed against the Apollinarians—was not forgotten; and the saintly primate of Cappadocian Cæsarea was brought forward as affirming that "God, the Immeasurable One, had been able to enter into connexion with death, by means

of the flesh, and without suffering," *i.e.* without suffering in the Godhead. "Life," said Gregory of Nyssa, "had tasted of death, the Judge had been dragged before a tribunal, the King of all the supramundane powers had not repelled the hands of the executioner": herein lay the supreme self-humiliation which, according to St. Paul, was to be the pattern of Christian unselfishness.

Cyril's second letter, the reply of Nestorius, the letter of Celestine, Cyril's third letter, and the quotations gathered from the Fathers, had now been read. It remained to produce, in the quaint language of the punctilious secretary Peter, specimens of "a book containing the blasphemies of the most pious Nestorius." "Let them be read," said the bishop of Philippi. Whereupon the secretary read some twenty extracts. In the sixteenth "quaternion" Nestorius had owned the Son of God, born of a woman, to be both God and man, but had remarked that the Father was not said to have sent His "Word;" in the twenty-first he had admitted even that God the Word had passed through the Virgin, but not that God was born of her; God the Word, he had said in another place, was incarnate, but was not born of Mary; in another he had shown in what sense he applied the term "God" to the Son of Mary, by remarking that Christ was "*called* God" because of his connexion with God the Word, with Him who was Son in the beginning, and similarly God the Word might be "*called*" Christ. Christ, he said again, might be "*called*" God in the same sense as, though in a higher degree than, Moses—alluding to Exod. vii. 1, "See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh." The extraordinary remark that Jesus said, not "He that eateth My Divinity" but "He that eateth My Flesh," appeared in the series. The last extract was the passage in which Nestorius had spoken of his people as pious but ignorant, and had laid the blame of their ignorance on their former teachers. Last of all the documents then read was the letter of Capreolus of Carthage, on which Cyril remarked that it contained a clear judgment: "His desire is that the ancient doctrines of the faith should be confirmed, and the new doctrines, absurdly invented and impiously expressed, should be rejected and expelled." All the bishops responded, "So say we all, this is the wish of us all;" and then, as the shadows of the June evening began to fall heavily, the formal sentence of deposition was promulgated against Nestorius, in the name of "Jesus Christ whom he had blasphemed." The sentence recites that "the most impious Nestorius" had refused to attend although formally

cited ; that the Council had therefore been obliged to ascertain his real sentiments, partly from his letters and writings, partly from his oral assertions lately made in this metropolis of Ephesus, and so, "being placed under urgent necessity by the canons, *and* by the letter of the most holy father and fellow-minister, Celestine, the bishop of the Romans' church, after many tears" (a conventional expression for "very reluctantly") had proceeded to "this melancholy decision, That Christ, by the Synod, pronounced Nestorius to be alien from the episcopal dignity and from every priestly assemblage." The bishops then signed in order, as "decreeing this with the holy Council," or as "agreeing with the holy Council;" and they then passed forth from St. Mary's church into the darkness which had now come on, but which was illuminated by the enthusiastic people with a multitude of tapers, while the women testified their joy by burning incense. The prelates themselves would rejoice in the vindication of the divinity of Christ; the female enthusiasts, we must needs think, were more powerfully moved by the securing of a title for His Mother.

Thus ended the first session of the Council. On looking back over its proceedings, we see clearly that the Council had not taken Celestine's action as decisive, had not accepted the position of being his instrument, but had assumed, as of right and as a matter of course, the very different position of supreme judge, however unjudicial had been its determination to act without the "Oriental" contingent. Why, then, it may be asked, did it ascribe such "constraining" authority to Celestine's letter, and seem to co-ordinate it with the canons? This was by way of compensation to Celestine for any apparent slight to his own sentence: it was politic, because the support of Rome was urgently required in view of an impending contest with the Court and with the "Orient;" and it was natural, considering the high dignity which all Churchmen then assigned to the first see, while as yet the precise scope of its legitimate action and influence had not been defined by the bishops themselves, and this was not the time for defining it.

Next day the bishops signified to Nestorius, under the title of "a new Judas," the sentence of his condemnation; and wrote to the clergy and people of Constantinople, desiring the clergy to take charge of all the property of their Church until they could hand it over to a new bishop. In these documents they speak as having themselves decided the question. Cyril occupied himself in writing

to his own people, and to two bishops and others at Constantinople, among whom the most remarkable was the aged Dalmatius, who, as archimandrite, presided over the monastic societies of the city; he had served in the body-guard of Theodosius the Great, and was held in high reverence by the present Emperor. On Saturday the 27th, various bishops preached on the subject of the controversy. Theodotus of Ancyra delivered an eloquent discourse, urging the personal unity of the God-Man as necessary to the efficacy of the Redemption, and describing the deposition of Nestorius as the necessary excision of a diseased member from the Church. Reginus of Constantia in Cyprus was asked to speak, and poured forth a vehement invective against Nestorius, whose sin he dared to describe as irremissible. Cyril himself spoke afterwards, in deference, as he said, to the insatiable eagerness of the congregation; taking care, as usual, to disclaim all notion of a "change of the Godhead" or any "fusion" in the assumption of humanity.

Meantime, the clouds were darkening overhead for a new tempest—it is Tillemont's apt metaphor. No popular ovation could long conceal the fact that the bishops, led by Cyril, had, by their refusal to wait a few days longer, involved themselves, and the cause of Catholic doctrine, in great difficulties, and brought new complications into a sufficiently embittered controversy. Candidian had addressed to the Council another short protest, and (on June 23) issued an edict declaring all that had been done to be null and void because all were not present. He sent to his master his own account of the late proceedings; and Nestorius, with about fifteen other metropolitans, despatched a complaint of the violence and irregularity of his opponents' conduct, and requested that he might be recalled to Constantinople and have the opportunity of stating his case before a more orderly synod. If he had been harshly treated by Memnon, he seems to have requited it by employing Candidian to harass the bishops, to hinder them from procuring food, and to encourage some rough peasants to insult them. After some time spent in drawing up the acts of the late session, they were sent to Theodosius, with a letter narrating its proceedings from the Council's point of view.

And now, on Friday the 26th, or Saturday the 27th, John of Antioch at last arrived, with about fourteen bishops. His indignation at finding that the Council had met and acted was shown by the steps which he took "in the very hour" of his arrival;

being joined by some Nestorianizers already at Ephesus, he proceeded at once to hold a Council of his own, without waiting to change his dusty garments. This assembly consisted of only forty-three bishops, among whom were Alexander of Hierapolis, Paul of Emesa, and Theodoret; and Candidian appeared before it, secure of its sympathy, to denounce Cyril, Memnon, and their adherents. After he had said his say, he left the room, and the "Orientals" in due form voted the deposition of Cyril and Memnon for violence, for heretical intention, as shown by their attempt to quash inquiry into the Cyrilline "articles" or anathemas, and for not awaiting the arrival of their brethren. Their supporters were declared "excommunicate," until they returned to the simplicity of the Nicene faith and anathematized the "articles" of Cyril. "Thus," says Tillemont, "the Orientals, who accused St. Cyril of an irregular proceeding, were guilty of one yet more irregular, which caused great trouble in the Church, which cannot be acquitted of schism, and which was manifestly unjust."

Theodosius naturally saw the case through the eyes of Candidian; and he wrote "to the Council of Ephesus" on June 29th, suspending all proceedings until he should send another commissioner to act with Candidian in examining into what had been done. To this the Council replied by asked him to receive five bishops as a deputation, and by denouncing their opponents as partly imbued with Nestorius's opinions, partly "Pelagian heretics." They had separated John and his fellows from their communion for having ill-treated their deputies after holding the rival Council; but they had not received from him any notification of its sentence against them, and only learned its nature from placards put up in the city. John went so far as to give out that he meant to consecrate a new bishop for Ephesus in the Church of St. John, and tried to force an entrance, attended by soldiers; this provoked a tumult, in which he and his companions were roughly handled, for the inhabitants of Ephesus, as a body, were on the side of Cyril and their own primate or "exarch." But we must observe that John did not espouse the cause of Nestorius, excepting so far as to deny the legitimacy of his condemnation. He and his friends drew up a letter for the Emperor, which was committed, like that of the Council itself, to the bearer of the Emperor's letter of June 29th.

Several days passed; and on July 10th, the Roman legates

having arrived, the Council held its second session in Memnon's house. Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip took care to bring forward the dignity of "their Pope," "the bishop of the apostolic see;" but Cyril continued to preside, both as bishop of Alexandria and as representing Celestine. A letter from Celestine was read in Latin: the bishops then asked that they might hear it translated into Greek; Philip, with a sort of gracious dignity, consented; and thus, in Greek and Latin, it appears in the Acts. It is remarkably explicit in recognising the supreme authority of the collective episcopate, which, when met in Council, represents the Apostles. "It is," says the Pope emphatically, "on all of us, priests of the Lord, in common, that the duty of teaching the faith, committed by Him to the apostles, has devolved." "Observe that we have received a general commission: for He has willed that we should all act, as He similarly entrusted that duty to all the apostles. Let us then undertake their labours, as we have all succeeded to them in office . . . that we may preserve what has been entrusted to us, and maintained by *apostolical succession* to this day." Celestine did not go into the details of the Nestorian question, but in general terms urged fidelity to apostolical teaching and reliance on the promised presence of Christ. It is here observable that he now treated the whole matter as having been submitted to the decision of the Council. He did not arbitrarily attempt to impose his own decision upon them, but placed himself in their class, and exhorted them to do their duty, intimating at the close that he felt sure that they would come to the same conclusion as he had already done. The bishops, after hearing this letter, exclaimed, "This is a just judgment! The whole Council renders thanks to Celestine, a new Paul, to Cyril, a new Paul, to Celestine, guardian of the faith, to Celestine as in accordance with the Council!" "One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith of the Council, one faith of the whole world!" One of the legates then observed that Celestine meant to remind them of what he had previously decided upon: on which Firmus remarked (evidently with an allusion to Celestine's language) that the Council put Rome's "sentence and formal regulation into execution by drawing up a canonical and *apostolical* judgment," thus securing the Council's final authority while seeming to echo the legate's words. The legates were then informed of the deposition of Nestorius: one of them took care, in reply, to insist on the primacy of Peter, and on Celestine's headship in regard to the

episcopate; Theodotus of Ancyra then referred to Celestine simply as a pattern of zeal for orthodoxy.

The third session was held next day, July 11th: the legates requested that the acts of the first session might be formally read; after hearing them, Philip affirmed the permanent presence of St. Peter, as holder of the keys, with his successor Celestine, and the three legates affirmed the deposition of Nestorius as settled by the action of their Pope *and* the decree of the Council. We are not to assume that silence on the part of the Council, as to this language of Philip's, implied consent. Greek habits of intercourse recognised no such principle; there might be many reasons for hearing this or that statement not only without protest, but even without comment; and a cardinal instance of this is the treatment of the famous letter of Ibas to Maris at the next General Council. It contained some language which, to the general mind of that assembly, must have been very objectionable; but no censure was passed upon it. It is observable that Cyril quietly modified the legates' representation by saying that they, "as representing the apostolical chair and *all the synod of Western bishops*, had carried out the orders of Celestine and agreed to the vote of the Council of Ephesus." Thus he distinguished the position of the legates, as really Celestine's agents, from that of the Council, and also distinctly associated the Western episcopate with Celestine in regard to the Roman judgment of the preceding year. The Council afterwards declared that the legates, who had spoken of themselves as bound to affirm its teaching, had spoken "suitably,"—a phrase which clearly refers to their professed agreement with the Council's own decision; as much as to say, "They have taken the line required by due order—have thus done what was to be expected on their part." The legates thereupon assented to the synodical judgment; and a letter was drawn up to be sent to Theodosius, in which the "Western Synod" was again referred to, and the Emperor was entreated to release the bishops from further attendance at Ephesus and to provide for the filling up of the see of Constantinople.

On the other hand, the Easterns entrusted to Count Irenæus, whom they sent in their own interest to Constantinople, letters to Theodosius, requesting to be allowed to meet "somewhere near" his court; and to the great officers of the court, passionately entreating them to uphold their cause, and protesting that

they durst not "look out of their lodgings, or get a breath of fresh air," for fear of the violence of their opponents. "Our houses," they say, "have been twice marked, so as to be more easily known by those who are to attack us." Irenæus appears to have started on his journey about the middle of July; and on the 16th, the Council, properly so called, held its fourth session, at which Cyril and Memnon formally complained of the sentence of deposition pronounced against them by the Orientals—a complaint which Acacius declared to be "unnecessary," inasmuch as any action of that kind on the part of "revolted" prelates was utterly null and void. "But," he added, "it is now our duty to call John to account for this deed;" and three bishops, Archelaus, Paul, and Peter, were sent to summon him. In vain they sought admission to his presence: they were threatened by soldiers, and had to hear many opprobrious remarks from a number of persons who gathered round them. They reported their ill success: it was resolved to send three other bishops, who did obtain a message from John, to the effect that he had nothing to say by way of answer to men deposed and excommunicate. On the next day, July 17th, at the fifth session, Cyril complained of John for having placarded him publicly as an Apollinarian. "I never," he said, "in my life approved of Apollinarian, Arian, or Eunomian opinions; from early childhood I learned the holy Scriptures and was trained by the hands of orthodox fathers." (Of course nobody could imagine that he was inclined to Arianism as such.) A third summons was sent to John, suspending him from his functions for declining the former citation, and menacing him with extremities if he declined this. The deputies sent were better treated than their predecessors, for the soldiers, and a priest of Antioch who had been his Church's agent at Constantinople, stood their friends. "A little pale man with a light beard" (one is grateful to the deputy who told this for a vivid touch here) came down to them with a paper; they found he was John's archdeacon. He took up their message to his bishop; but on returning announced that John would receive nothing from the Council. The Council, instead of absolutely deposing John, excluded him from its communion, with his supporters, including Theodoret. A letter was written to the Emperor informing him of this; and another to Celestine, referring to his former "just condemnation" of Nestorius, but laying the main stress on the "just sentence of deposition" whereby the *Council* had

"overthrown an impious heresy." It has been their bounden duty, say the bishops, to report to Celestine their proceedings—natural language enough in reference to the first see; and, although they might rightly have deposed John for his conduct towards occupants of principal sees, yet they have reserved his case for Celestine's judgment, in the hope that such forbearance might overcome John's temerity. To say that their "right" depended on the legates' assent is simply to read new matter into their epistle, at the end of which they made the important announcement—which sends us suddenly back to the great Western controversy, to the letters of Julian, and to the final letter of Zosimus—that having read the Roman decisions against the Pelagians, they had affirmed them all, and treated the Pelagians, including Julian, as heretics. With regard to the pretended sentence against Cyril and Memnon, passed by about thirty men, it had been treated as an impertinent absurdity. "We have continued to celebrate divine service with them, as before." This procedure of the Council as to the measures taken by John against Cyril and Memnon is referred to in a letter of the Orientals to Theodosius. They tell him that they had been called to account by their adversaries, but had said they would await his judgment; and request him to summon them from Ephesus to Constantinople, or else to Nicomedia, in order to a full inquiry, and to insist that two bishops only shall accompany each metropolitan, for a crowd of bishops does no good. "*They* came in crowds; we came only three from each province." They also ask that all persons be required to abide by the Nicene Creed, adding nothing to it, and "to refrain, on the one hand, from calling Christ a mere man, for He is perfect God and perfect Man; and, on the other hand, from ascribing suffering to His Godhead."

The sixth session was held on the 22nd of July, and the first business proceeded with seems to have been intended as a reply to those who accused the Council of making additions to the Nicene faith. A doctrinal statement was brought forward, beginning with the original Nicene Creed, but illustrating its true import by quotations from the Fathers. Then came forward Charisius, a priest and church-steward of Philadelphia, and made a statement to this effect: twenty-one sectarians in Lydia, chiefly "Quartodecimans," had wished to join the Church, and had been induced by two Nestorianizing priests from Constantinople, James and Antony, to adopt, as the Catholic symbol, what was in fact a

Nestorian formula (ascribed by Marius Mercator to Theodore); it was, at any rate, Nestorian if taken literally, as representing Jesus of Nazareth in the light of a man inseparably conjoined to the Divine Word, although (as usual) it disclaimed the supposition of Two Sons and affirmed One Son and Lord. The signatures of these ignorant persons, deceived into taking this formula for that of the Church, were read in Council; and then was passed the memorable prohibition, "That no one should present, or compose, or frame a different creed from that of Nicæa; and that whoever should so compose, or propose, or offer one to persons wishing to come over to the Church, should, if clerics, be deposed, if laymen, be anathematized." Although much discussion has arisen as to the bearing and results of this decree, its meaning is quite evident: "There is only one real baptismal creed, or test of belief, to be subscribed by proselytes; and to invent or use another is a high offence." In order to secure uniformity on this point, it would not have been enough to prohibit any creed differing in purport from the Nicene: it was necessary to exclude any which differed in wording, however it might claim to agree in sense, for such a claim would have invited discussion, when discussion was to be deprecated for the purpose in hand; and we shall see that this sense of the prohibition was that which Cyril himself put upon it. Observe further that *all* use of any doctrinal formula beside the Nicene Creed is not forbidden by this decree, but only such use as had been made of the pretended creed in the case of the Lydian converts. There is no doubt, however, that in strictness this disciplinary ordinance of the Third Council is adverse to the Western use of the "Apostles' Creed" as the baptismal formula; but it entirely fails to touch our use of the "Quicumque," although it has often been quoted (for instance, by Macaulay) as prohibiting it.

The seventh and last session was held in St. Mary's church, on the 31st of July. Rheginus, on the part of the Cypriot bishops, complained of John of Antioch for interfering with their insular church and claiming to consecrate its bishops. Was this claim, asked the Council, ever admitted or acted upon in former times? They were assured by Zeno, another Cypriot bishop, that from the earliest times their bishoprics had been filled up by the episcopate of their island under the presidency of the see of Salamis. It will be remembered that Alexander of Antioch had given a different account to Pope Innocent. The Council evidently felt that it had only an *ex parte* statement to go upon: as Le Quien

puts it, "no one was present to maintain the rights, if any such existed, of Antioch over Cyprus;" and the decision was therefore cast into a hypothetical form, that *if* their statement were true, the bishops of Cyprus must retain their independence in the matter of episcopal appointments; and the like principle must be applied to other "dioceses," so that a bishop who has usurped authority over a province not properly subject to his see must resign such authority, "lest, under the pretence of priestly action, the arrogance of worldly power should creep in, and we should imperceptibly lose that freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men, gave us with His own blood"—words remarkably like those which the African Council had addressed to Celestine just seven years before, at the close of the case of Apiarius. The resolution before us is usually described as establishing the "*Jus Cyprium*," and has been repeatedly urged by Anglican divines—notably by Archbishop Bramhall—as applicable to the case of the Church in Britain. Phrased as it was, it could hardly be taken as finally settling the question; and some fifty years later the see of Antioch would have asserted its jurisdiction but for the opportune "discovery" of the remains of St. Barnabas near Salamis.

We must pass rapidly over some minor matters. An old bishop, Eustathius of Sidon, had long before resigned under various vexations; another had been appointed. Eustathius now begged to keep the title of a bishop, and to return after long absence to his own country, without claiming any episcopal jurisdiction. This was granted. Severe measures were ordered to be taken with all persons suspected of Messalian fanaticism; for there were many such in Pamphylia. The Thracian custom, whereby one bishop held two bishoprics together, was allowed to stand, the fear being expressed on the part of two Thracian bishops that Fritilas, bishop of Heraclea, having Nestorianized, might ordain new bishops for some of these Thracian towns. Juvenal of Jerusalem, who had already in the Council alluded significantly to the "apostolic throne" of his church, claimed the primacy over Palestine; but his friend Cyril demurred to the project, on the ground that Cæsarea had a traditional and canonical right which could not be barred: and Jerusalem failed, though only for the time, to attain patriarchal dignity.

The Canons of Ephesus are prefaced by a statement to the effect that some bishops—rather more than thirty—"fell away"

from the Council, under the leadership of John of Antioch. Their names are given; then it is declared that they were without ecclesiastical power "to injure or profit any one," some of them having already been found to agree with Nestorius *and* Cœlestius (observe the combination), in that they would not join in condemning Nestorius: they are excommunicated by the Council, and deprived of all priestly function. Then follow six canons. The first ordains that any metropolitan who has joined or shall join the "synod of revolt," or shall hold with Cœlestius, shall forfeit all authority over his suffragans. By the second, any bishops who had gone over to the "revolters," even after joining in the deposition of Nestorius (a passage which shows that there had been some such defections), are deprived. Orthodox priests, degraded by Nestorius or his supporters for orthodoxy, are restored by the third canon to their rank; and all clerics are forbidden to own the authority of "revolted" bishops. Clerics who have fallen away to Nestorianism or Cœlestianism are deposed by the fourth canon. Clerics deposed for misconduct by the Council or their own bishops, and restored by Nestorius, "with his usual indifference to Church discipline," or by his supporters, are declared by the fifth to remain deposed; and finally, the sixth canon fulminates deposition or excommunication against ecclesiastics or clerics who may attempt to unsettle any decision of the "holy Council of Ephesus."

With these canons, the "Acts" of the Council of Ephesus come to an end.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS.—PART II.

WE must now, in order to understand the position of affairs, look to Constantinople. At first the orthodox had found it impossible to send messengers to the capital, for their opponents kept watch at town gates, country roads, and harbours. But a beggar managed, in the earlier part of July, to carry a letter from Cyril to the bishops and monks, concealed in the hollow of the cane with which he walked. This letter produced an immense sensation. Dalmatius thought that the crisis was a call to him to leave his monastery, having never passed its threshold for forty-eight years. The old man came forth, and headed a long procession of monks and abbots, chanting psalms, to the palace. He, with the other abbots, was at once admitted to the presence of the Emperor, and was allowed to suggest to Theodosius what he should write to the Council. Theodosius read the letter which had been so strangely brought to the capital. "If things be so," he said, "let the bishops deputed by the Council come to me." "Not one of them," said Dalmatius, "is allowed to come." "No one hinders them," said the Emperor. "Yes, they *are* hindered: the other party are free to send deputies to you, but the Council is not. To whom will you listen? To six thousand bishops" (by this extravagant enumeration he meant all who agreed with Cyril), "or to one impious man?" Theodosius was not the man to withstand this urgency: he asked for the prayers of Dalmatius, who, on coming out, told the excited crowd that had followed him that they would all go to the church of St. Mocius. This involved a progress along the main street of Constantinople, through the forum of Constantine, and then, through the forum of Theodosius I. and that of Arcadius, to the suburb called "Exokionion." The whole

body set forth, chanting the 150th Psalm; the monks held tapers in their hands, and shouted out against "the enemy." A large concourse met them, and accompanied them to "the martyr's church." There the Cyrilline despatch was read, and the conference with the Emperor described: the people of Constantinople with one voice exclaimed, "Anathema to Nestorius!"

It was, perhaps, even before Theodosius's permission to send deputies had actually reached Ephesus, that the Council sent two bishops, Theopemptus and Daniel, to Constantinople. They made a considerable impression; but it seems that they uttered a grave misstatement, if it be true that they persuaded the high chamberlain that Nestorius had absolutely condemned the term *Theotocos*. Three days after their arrival, Irenæus arrived, and succeeded to some extent in persuading the State functionaries that Cyril had acted unfairly. Again, however, the scene shifted: Cyril's physician and confidential secretary, John, came to Constantinople, and turned the opinion of the magistrates against Irenæus. The imperial approval of Cyril's deposition, which had been sent to the cathedral to be published, was modified; and Theodosius was advised to take the extraordinarily illogical step of treating Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius, as alike deposed, and to send a new commissioner to Ephesus.

Thus a fresh scene in the drama of the Nestorian controversy was opened in the beginning of August, 431, when the new Imperial Commissioner, John, the High Treasurer, arrived at Ephesus with a letter, in which Theodosius indicated his profound ignorance of the existing state of affairs—in fact, his confusion of ideas upon the subject—by gravely informing Celestine, Rufus, and a long list of other bishops, that he accepted the deposition of all three prelates, Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius, as "signified by your Piety." Some tidings of these instructions had reached Ephesus; and a sermon of Cyril's, said to have been preached at Ephesus before he was arrested, may be thought to belong to the last days of July: it is remarkable for the emphasis with which it cites texts about trial and persecution. "He who says that Christ is true God, and rebukes those that believe it not," so says Cyril at the close of this discourse, "is he who confesses Him." The sermon is also noteworthy as all but expressly saying that Christ's Manhood was a human "nature," the term "nature" being usually applied in the Cyrilline phraseology to His Godhead. "Being God by nature, He became like

us, not having cast aside His existence as God, but having honoured the nature of man."

Count John's arrival, as we learn from his own narrative to the Emperor, was hindered by some important affairs, but for which, he writes, he would have arrived sooner. When he came, he "greeted the bishops who had assembled;" but his presence produced much excitement. Cyril and Memnon put themselves on their guard; Count John desired all the prelates to attend at his lodgings the next day, and in order to prevent any collision, such as the hot temper of the opposing parties might produce, took pains to arrange the order in which they should enter. All appeared except Memnon. The question at first mooted was as to the reading of the imperial letter. "It cannot be read," said the adherents of Cyril, "in the presence of Nestorius, or of the Orientals who came with John of Antioch. They are out of our communion." "It cannot be read," retorted their opponents, "in the hearing of Cyril or of Memnon." Nearly the whole day was spent in this dispute; at last, Count John, in his own words, "removed Nestorius and Cyril by persuasion, and, if one must say the truth, by force." Then he read the Emperor's letter. John of Antioch and his friends approved of it. The others protested that Cyril and Memnon had not been deposed by any competent authority. "To prevent further sedition," as he expressed it, the Count handed over Nestorius to the keeping of Candidian, and Cyril to that of another count named James. Memnon being absent, two Church officials, with the archdeacon of Ephesus, were sent to inform him of his deposition, and to demand possession of the Church property. He quietly assured them that he would, at his own peril, keep it safe. Count John now thought fit to go to the cathedral to say his prayers, and sent one of the "Palatines," or officials of the chief civil departments, to summon Memnon. When he came, as he did without further delay, Count John asked, "Why did you not come to me in the morning?" "Because I was unwell." The Count proceeded to give him what he delicately called "admonition" or counsel; but Memnon cut him short by proceeding at once to the Count's own dwelling, where he was presently given into the custody of Count James. Thus ended the first day; and Count John at once drew up his report to the Emperor, in which he not only suppressed the fact that Cyril's adherents formed the great majority, but virtually represents them as altogether in the wrong.

This, then, was the position of matters. The "Orientals," as they are specifically called, that is, the Antiochene party, were for the time content to put aside the claim of Nestorius: they wrote to the Church of Antioch, rejoicing in the arrest of Cyril and Memnon, and proclaiming that God was on their side; and to Acacius of Beroëa, in similar terms, and with denunciations of the anathematisms of Cyril. The arrested prelates, meantime, were treated with considerable severity; they were, as the Orientals describe it, guarded in separate rooms, night and day, by a multitude of soldiers; these guards, as Cyril himself tells us, slept at the doors of their chambers. The feelings of the orthodox bishops in these circumstances may be easily imagined. They wrote a professedly synodical letter to the Emperor, in which they recounted the attempts of Nestorius to "corrupt the true faith by sophisms alien to its nature;" his consequent excommunication; the intrigues of some thirty or more bishops, adherents of John of Antioch, by whose representations Theodosius had been led to think that the Council had deposed Cyril and Memnon. The Council, they assert, had done nothing of the kind; on the contrary, it had acted only against Nestorius and his abettors. The Emperor had, by his own letter, admitted that Nestorius had been synodically deposed: it followed then that the proceedings of his abettors, dictated as they were by a spirit of revenge, must be of no force, and the Emperor was therefore requested to restore to the Council its "leaders," Cyril and Memnon. On learning that Count John had misstated the case to Theodosius and that the court of Constantinople was considering whether Cyril and Memnon should not be banished, the orthodox were greatly disturbed, as Cyril expresses it, and wrote another letter to the Emperor, reiterating that the Council had never deposed Cyril or Memnon, but only Nestorius, "the herald of the heresy of the Man-worshippers," *i.e.* those who offered a relative worship to a Christ not really divine. They complained that the Emperor's letter had associated them with the separatist Antiochenes; they requested again that Cyril and Memnon might be liberated, and they suggested that the Emperor might send some new commissioners to procure "accurate" information—or, as Tillemont explains the passage, might allow the Council to send deputies to his court. Count John, on his part, endeavoured to persuade them to hold communion with the Orientals; they refused to do so, unless the latter condemned Nestorius and confessed their own misconduct. "Will you,"

asked the Count, "at least draw up a statement of faith, that it may be shown to them and become a basis of reconciliation?" "No," said the bishops; "we will not put a slur upon ourselves, as if our faith were open to question:" an answer which might well seem perverse. "We have no need," they added, "to instruct the Emperor as to the faith in which he was baptized." On the other hand, they were asked, according to the Orientals' account, to subscribe the Nicene Creed as the exclusive formula, and to disown the Cyrilline articles: they refused. Would the Orientals, then, draw up a doctrinal statement? They consented to do so; but they found some difficulty as to the wording, if Cyril was rightly informed: some would call the Virgin Theotocos, if she might also be called Anthropotocos; others declared that they would sooner let their hands be cut off. A letter *was*, however, drawn up for the Emperor, containing a short doctrinal statement, in which Mary was owned as Theotocos, "inasmuch as God the Word became incarnate, and from the moment of conception united to Himself the temple which He derived from her." Of this statement—which, unless "temple" was used (as by Nestorius) for an individual human person, was quite orthodox—Theodoret was either the author or the approver. It was disapproved by the thorough-going Alexander of Hierapolis; but it ultimately became "the Formulary of Reunion."

The orthodox further wrote to the clergy and laity of Constantinople a letter, which is vivid with indignation and eager desire for relief from their troubles. "We cannot," they say, "see the gracious face of the Emperor, from whence alone" (observe the ineradicable habit of exaggeration in regard to an Emperor's character or office) "we can expect a release from annoyances; we therefore have recourse to you, who are in fact members of the Œcumenical Council, as having shown throughout your zeal for true religion" (an extraordinary extension of a received phrase). "Ephesus is to us no better than a prison; we have been rigorously shut up here for three months. Only with great difficulty, and by assuming various disguises, have any messengers of ours reached the capital. Some persons, we hear, accuse us at court of sedition; others have dared to affirm that we have deposed the archbishop of Alexandria and bishop Memnon; some have, perhaps, gone so far as to say that we have entered into friendly relations with the synod of revoltors under John of Antioch. All this is false. We should indeed deem it a privilege to be banished along

with Cyril and Memnon. We have anathematized John and his adherents, first, because they patronised the impious Nestorius ; secondly, because they have outraged justice and truth in regard to Cyril and Memnon ; thirdly, because they have not ceased to think with Nestorius"—this last assertion was obviously a mere inference from the proceedings of the minority. "We had rather be deprived of our churches than communicate with them, unless they entirely retrace their steps. Ask, we beg of you, that we may have Cyril and Memnon restored to us, and be set free from this detention, which is but confinement under a fair name ; let us be admitted to the Emperor's presence, or at least be allowed to return to our churches, lest we all die of illness or of sorrow." To this was appended a note, indicating that the bishops were suffering in health, but worded in the usual style of exaggeration. "We are being killed with heat and bad air : every day, or almost every day, some one is buried ; all the servants are sent away sick to their homes. Pray represent to the Emperor our distressing state ; but be well assured that if they make us all die here, we will never alter what has been settled through us by Christ our Saviour." With this letter and appended note should be compared a letter of Cyril's to the Church of Constantinople, on which we have already relied for information, and which mentions not only illness as prevalent among the bishops, but serious pecuniary difficulties. "Very many have died," writes Cyril, "and the rest are selling what belongs to them, having no other resource." He wrote to three of his own suffragans, Potammon, Theopemptus, and Daniel, then at Constantinople : "We have been calumniated as though we had been accompanied hither by many people from the baths of Alexandria, or by women of religious life," literally, women on the ecclesiastical "canon" or register—those who did not live in community, but led a dedicated life in their own homes. "Some say, also, that Nestorius's condemnation was brought about by an intrigue of mine—was not really intended by the Council. But these slanders were rebuked by Count John after inquiry ; and he ascertained that Nestorius had been condemned by the Council, not to gratify anybody, but out of holy zeal for the truth. But we were given into custody, and are still in custody ; what will come of it, we know not ; but we thank God that we have been counted worthy to suffer bonds, and more than bonds, for His Name. The Council has refused to communicate with John of Antioch.

‘Here,’ it has said, ‘are our bodies, our churches, our cities; they are at your disposal; but communicate with the Orientals we will not, we cannot, until they give up their plottings against our colleagues, and own the true faith, for they are proved to think and speak with Nestorius.’ This is the very point of the whole contention. Let all the orthodox,” concludes Cyril, “pray for us: as David says, ‘I am ready for scourges’”—alluding to the LXX. of Ps. xxxvii. 18 (=xxxviii. 17).

Hefele considers that the letter of the Council to the clergy at Constantinople was crossed on its road by one from seven bishops then in the capital, dated the 20th of Messori (the 13th of August), and expressing cordial sympathy. “We have contributed what we could, our tears and our prayers. Moreover, we have confirmed the people in their steadfastness, kindled zeal in very many, assisted the priests as they desired; but we would fain do more: write us a letter, telling us what to do, and relieve our anxiety. If you wish it, we will come to Ephesus; if not, we will stay here and work for you,—and it is reported that the Emperor has come to a better mind upon the question.” The bishops at Ephesus replied with thanks, and requested their brethren to remain at Constantinople rather than take a fruitless journey to Ephesus; they might do essential service by informing the Emperor of the true state of matters, of which, it was to be presumed, he had no clear knowledge. The former letters sent to them had apparently not been received; another was therefore sent, and a separate one was despatched to the Emperor.

The clergy of Constantinople were not wanting to the occasion; before they had received the last of these despatches from Ephesus, they had addressed a protest to Theodosius, which appears in the “Acts” immediately after the letter last described. “It is a duty,” they said, “to speak out ‘even before kings, and not be ashamed.’ The Emperor has been misinformed; the Council had never deposed Cyril or Memnon; it was the revolvers, mostly heretical, and without cities, and excommunicate, who had passed that utterly invalid and puerile sentence; the true Council consisted of the majority, orthodox in faith, superior in the dignity of their sees: to gratify the minority, in the hope of securing peace, was, in fact, to ensure a widespread dissension. If Cyril, the leader of the Council, has been thus irregularly dealt with, all who acted with him will be *ipso facto* involved in a like penalty; it is the duty of a sovereign who loves Christ to take care that the

Church which has nursed him be not rent asunder, nor the period of his reign made an epoch of martyrs." Of all the ecclesiastics then at Constantinople the venerable abbot Dalmatius was the most influential in the cause of the Council and of Cyril; and it seems that he added to his former services another interposition which may have had the effect of softening the feelings of the court towards Cyril and Memnon. We have a letter from him to the Council, in which he tells them that he had acted on their requests. He was not "careless when the orthodox faith was concerned: they who rightly divide the word of truth have life here and hereafter; they who have fallen away from God's grace are cursed and cast into outer darkness, like Nestorius and those who think with him." We read also of Alypius, who held the great place of priest of the Apostles' Church in Constantinople—the church of imperial and episcopal tombs—and who wrote about this time to Cyril, comparing him to Elijah, Phinehas, and Daniel, and also, by calling him an imitator of his uncle Theophilus, indicated that he himself had inherited party feelings against Chrysostom. The interesting part of this letter is the reference to Cyril's greatest predecessor. Athanasius, by prayer, had repelled the plots of heretics, had refuted their calumnies, had endured exile, had "shone out in purer lustre through every trial of his patience, had woven himself a crown of martyrdom, established the Homousion, trampled down Arianism, lifted up orthodoxy, exalted the holy throne of St. Mark;" and Cyril had followed in his footsteps. All that had recently been done in defence of the truth at Constantinople Cyril would learn from the bearer, the deacon Candidian. It is singular to contrast this eulogy with the warning letter written by Isidore of Pelusium to Cyril: "Do not pass violent sentences, but submit all accusations to a just trial. The Divine words, 'I will go down now and see' (Gen. xviii. 21), admonish us to be accurate in the investigation of matters. Many of those at Ephesus accuse you of carrying on a personal quarrel, and not seeking in an orthodox spirit the things that are Jesus Christ's. They say that Cyril is nephew to Theophilus, and shows a like disposition."

The archbishop of Alexandria appears to have chosen this time of enforced leisure for a task which had been suggested to him by some, at least, of his brother bishops—the "Explanation" of his anathemas. In entering upon it, he declares that he could not but draw up these articles, from regard for the souls of those who

might fall in with the writings of Nestorius ; he admits that there may be some who, while clear of Nestorian opinions or sympathies, do not understand the purport of the anathemas, and he accordingly thinks it worth while to explain them one after another. A few specimens of this exposition may here be added. The Incarnation, which involves the accuracy of the term Theotocos, was effected in a manner transcending human comprehension, but carries with it no confusion between Godhead and manhood, no conversion of Godhead into flesh. The phrase "natural union," which had given special offence, was explained to mean a "real union:" after this union had been effected, there was one Emmanuel, God and Man, not a God and a man connected by community of honour or powers. As to the various phrases in Scripture referring to the Godhead or the manhood, there was no question as to recognising the manhood in the Emmanuel ; "what had relation to manhood must be confined to the limits of His manhood, for to Him belongs manhood:" the important point was, that Divine and human attributes must alike be referred to His one person, in its Divine or in its human aspect—not to two distinct individuals. Christ was not to be called "a God-bearing man," because that phrase implied a double individuality ; He was God Incarnate. Repeatedly does Cyril point out that the Nestorian theory really reduced the difference between Christ and human saints to a difference of degree : as if in Him, as well as in them, there was a visitation or indwelling of God and such visitation was but fuller in Him than in them. The anathema against the joint worship of the Word and the Man was directed against this notion ; so was that which proclaimed the Word Incarnate Himself, as man, to have acted as High Priest. In regard to the eleventh anathema, Cyril writes, "We celebrate in our churches the holy, life-giving, and bloodless sacrifice ; not believing that which is set forth to be the body of an individual man, but rather receiving it as having become the very own Body and Blood of the Word which gives life to all ; for common flesh is unable to give life, and of this our Saviour assures us, saying, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth.'"

The last anathema, which affirmed that the Word Himself had suffered in flesh, is explained, of course, by reference to His manhood. Cyril owns, or rather proclaims, that the Divine Nature is impassible ; but he says, the Word made flesh could, as Scripture says, *suffer in the flesh* (1 Pet. iv. 1, "Christ suffered in the flesh"), because He had appropriated to Himself that flesh which could

suffer; and he concludes by insisting that the Crucified must not be regarded as an individual man separate from the Word, but as the Word Himself, "the Lord of glory," in His passible flesh or manhood.

The next scene in the controversy was opened when Theodosius, yielding to the representations of the orthodox, resolved to receive deputies from the two contending parties at Ephesus, and permitted each to choose its representatives. The orthodox chose two of the Roman legates, with Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavian, Firmus, Theodotus, Acacius of Melitene, and Eupotius. The bishops who sent them gave them a letter of instructions: it was written in the name of "the holy (Ecumenical Council, assembled in the metropolitan city of Ephesus by the grace of God and the command of the most pious Emperor." The deputies were bidden to hold no communion with John of Antioch and "the Sanhedrin of revolt," because, instead of joining in the condemnation of Nestorius, they had, up to that moment, espoused his cause (another case of unfair exaggeration); because they had, against all canons, condemned Cyril and Memnon; because some of them were "Cœlestians," and some had been deposed, and they had dared to cast on the Ecumenical Council the slur of heresy. But if pressure were put upon them by the Emperor—"since one ought, as far as possible, to obey a Christ-loving and pious sovereign"—then, in case the Orientals chose to sign the condemnation of Nestorius, to ask pardon in writing from the Council for their offence against its chiefs (here called "archbishops" in an honorary sense), to exert themselves for the release of the latter, and to anathematize the opinions of Nestorius and reject those who openly agree with him, *then* the deputies might promise to communicate with them, and write to the bishops at Ephesus accordingly; for there could be no complete reconciliation until the Council's assent was received. "But you are not to promise to communicate with them until the Council receives its chiefs again. If you neglect any of these instructions, the Council will neither accept what you may do nor hold communion with you." This document was signed first by Verinian, bishop of Perga. A letter was also written to the Emperor, giving a summary of the events at Ephesus: after which the bishops say, "We lately sent to your Pre-eminence a report of these proceedings; and now, by this letter, and by our deputies, we stretch out our hands, and touch your pious knees, beseeching you that what has been done

by virtue of fraud, and contrary to the canons, against Cyril and Memnon may be of none effect, so that the Council may not be left headless. Cyril and Memnon," they add, "are orthodox: the whole Western synod attests this; we, who are fully informed, have in writing affirmed it. We pray your Majesty to loose us from our chains; for we are bound with those who are bound, being our brethren and our chiefs." The Western episcopate is here again assumed to have co-operated with the bishop of Rome.

The Orientals also chose deputies—John of Antioch, John of Damascus, Himerius of Nicomedia, Paul of Emesa (whose name will afterwards come before us in a remarkable way, and who held the proxy of Acacius of Bercea), Macarius of Laodicea who also held the proxy of Cyrus of Tyre, Apringius of Chalcis who also held the proxy of Alexander of Apamea, Theodoret who also held the proxy of Alexander of Hierapolis, and Helladius of Ptolemais: eight in all. The letter of instructions given to them was a grant of full powers and promised to ratify "whatever they should do, tending to promote the fear of God and the peace and good order of the Church," whether it were done "before the Emperor, or in his consistory, or before the sacred senate, or in a synod of fathers." If they had to sign anything in the name of their principals at Ephesus, they were to do so; if, again, signatures were requested from their principals, they should readily be given: one point only being secured, that the heretical articles added by Cyril to the Nicene Creed should be anathematized, as alien to the mind of the Catholic and Apostolic Church." Alexander of Hierapolis, as chief of the bishops left behind, added a note of his own in the like sense. The deputies set out for Constantinople before the 25th of August, and reached Nicomedia about the beginning of September. But the Emperor had changed his mind as to the place of the promised hearing: it seemed more expedient that it should not be at Constantinople (the Orientals thought that he apprehended disorder on the part of the monks, who, as we have seen, were zealous against Nestorius), and the two parties of deputies were commanded to await his arrival at Chalcedon, or, properly speaking, at Rufinianum, a suburb of that city, otherwise called "the Oak" and as such unhappily memorable in St. Chrysostom's history. No sooner did the Orientals arrive at Chalcedon than they heard news which troubled them, and was in effect an augury of the Emperor's disposition. Nestorius had, a week before, been ordered to leave Ephesus, and at his own

request had been permitted to go to his old monastery, situated outside the walls of Antioch. This, as the deputies wrote to their principals, indicated that the deposition of Nestorius was regarded as valid: a remark which shows that they had previously hoped to get it cancelled. The prefect's letter to Nestorius is extant, and professes to grant him, at his own desire, permission to leave Ephesus, providing him with conductors and with all appliances for his journey, and adding a prayer that he might arrive safe at his journey's end. Instead of treating him as a criminal, the prefect remarks that a person so wise and so eminent would not be in want of consolation. Nestorius, in his extant answer, intimates that he thinks it "an honour to be sent away in the cause of piety;" but hopes that the prefect will "remind the pious Emperor to denounce, by public imperial letters, the verboriousities of Cyril."

It was on the 11th of the Syro-Greek month Gorpiaëus, which corresponded to the 11th of September, that the deputies wrote as above, and were expecting that Theodosius would on that very day arrive at the place of meeting. "Himerius had not yet joined them; he was probably hindered on his journey." They were evidently dispirited, but were striving to be hopeful. They had no church open to them, for the bishop was adverse to them, and the clergy and monks were of the same mind. But they had, at any rate, a number of the laity on their side, who came frequently to visit them; they could boast of addressing large congregations in a court surrounded by quadrangular cloisters; the preacher stood on a platform or raised seat, and the hearers, we are told, "would have stayed beyond midday if they could have endured the heat of the sun." It is added that many came over from Constantinople to hear their addresses, and to exhort them to persevere in their resistance to the Cyrilline teaching. But what would the Emperor himself say? He, at first, gave them some reason for hoping that they would triumph. At the first audience the orthodox read their papers; the Orientals replied, giving their view of the doctrinal question; and the Emperor, as they thought, agreed with them. They accused Acacius of Melitene of having maintained that the Deity could suffer; Theodosius started back in horror, and shook his "pallium," or imperial purple, to express his indignation at such a blasphemy. The orthodox entreated him to summon Cyril to Chalcedon, and let him state his own case. But Theodosius preferred to demand from each party a written doctrinal

statement. "We can make none," said the Orientals, "beside the existing creed of Nicæa." "This," say they in their account, "pleased his Majesty." Therefore they presented the document, framed at Ephesus, in which that creed was contained. They believed that they had the imperial advisers on their side, and were returning to their lodgings in good spirits, when a number of orthodox zealots threw stones at them, and a fight took place, in which some of their lay friends and some of the hostile monks were wounded. They wrote, after this first audience, to their brethren at Ephesus, "prematurely boasting of victory," and asking them to sign the document above referred to, after making two copies of it. To this the Orientals at Ephesus replied: "We have signed two copies of what you have sent us. We beg you to contend even unto blood against the new heresy. We are ready to die rather than admit one of Cyril's heretical articles;" so that now they rejected any use of "Theotocos," whereas John of Antioch had admitted the phrase. They proceeded to argue from the heterodoxy of those articles to the nullity of the deposition of Nestorius, as pronounced by heterodox persons who had accepted the articles: but this statement, as regarded the Council itself, was untrue. "We are afraid that if that deposition be treated as valid, the heretical articles will be affirmed also. We send a copy of the Alexandrian's recently composed 'Explanation,' which gives yet clearer proof of his impiety," an assertion which goes to prove that at this moment they were virtually Nestorians. They also wrote to the Emperor, acknowledging his gracious reception of their deputies, denouncing the Cyrilline articles, and expressing a hope that his justice would not allow a deposition pronounced by heretics to hold good. Without naming Nestorius, they describe him as "that person who had been wronged by those who received the teaching of Cyril," and who personally would fain retire into private life, but they urge that his condemnation would mean ruin to the faith.

This reticence as to a name that had been so much in the mouths of all men was the result of information as to the feeling of the court. This feeling was more and more evinced during the deputies' sojourn at Chalcedon. They found that the members of the "consistory" were offended at hearing the name of Nestorius. The gentle temper of Theodosius did not prevent him from saying to Theodore and others, "Let no one mention that man to me again. His case has been once for all decided." The Emperor

was very willing to listen to Theodoret on any other subject. Hearing that great numbers resorted to the Oriental deputies, he remarked upon it in a private audience. "Is it fair," rejoined Theodoret, "that excommunicated heretics" (for in that style he, as a matter of course, described the deputies of the Council) "should be officiating in church, and *we* who are contending for the faith should not have access to any church?" The Emperor quietly asked, "Well, what would you have me do?" "Do what Count John did at Ephesus; forbid both parties to officiate until peace is restored. Tell the bishop of this place to allow neither us nor our opponents to hold services until we are reconciled." "I cannot give orders to bishops," was the characteristic reply of Theodosius. "Well, then, do not let *him* give orders to us. We will take a church for our own use, and there officiate; and then you will see that more will frequent our services than those of our opponents. We have held meetings, but only for prayer; we have had no reading of Scripture, no oblation." Theodosius tacitly allowed them to go on as they had done; but Theodoret evidently felt that the toleration was precarious.

Meanwhile, audiences of both parties were being held from time to time in the imperial presence: five, say the Orientals, in all. As we have just seen, it was vain for the latter to plead the cause of Nestorius; whatever attempt they made was sure to be unsuccessful. In regard to the question of doctrine, they contended eagerly for the condemnation of the Cyrilline anathemas, as a necessary condition of the restoration of peace. They found, however, that a line of mere denunciation was impolitic; and accordingly requested that there might be a regular discussion of the anathemas, undertaking to prove that they were heretical. To this their opponents would not consent. Tillemont intimates some surprise that they declined a proposition which seemed so reasonable. But, in default of any paper or memoir of theirs which might check the account given by their adversaries, it may be conjectured, either that they refused to reopen a question settled, as they would say, by decree of the Council, or else that they were incensed by the language held concerning Cyril by the Oriental deputies, to the effect that "even if he abandoned his articles, he could not be restored to communion, because he had been the leader of a heretical movement." This the Oriental deputies more than once affirmed "with an oath." And it may have been this intemperate language which stopped all discussion, and thus

prevented the Orientals from adducing, as they were prepared to do, passages from Athanasius, Basil, Damasus, Ambrose, etc.—passages, manifestly, which were aimed against Apollinarianism; their point being that the Cyrilline articles were Apollinarian.

Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, had urged that the Nicene Creed should not be in any way compromised; taking advantage of this, they informed him that Cyril and Memnon had been deposed for making a heretical addition to the Creed (which was clearly a grave misrepresentation), and quoted the fourth Antiochene canon, which had already been used against St. Chrysostom, to the effect that a bishop once deposed ought not to resume his functions without a fresh synodical decision in his favour. Cyril and Memnon, they said indignantly, cease not to officiate, as if they had no regard for the text, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," etc. Five times had the Emperor given audience to them and to their adversaries: he had ordered the Cyrilline party either to reject the Cyrilline articles, or to defend them in discussion; they had refused to do either. And here the letter undertakes to describe Cyril's statements; he had taught, in his articles, that the Godhead of the Son, and not His Manhood, had suffered, and that John i. 14 meant that from the Godhead and the Manhood was made up one nature, as if Godhead had been converted into flesh; and again they allege that Cyril's language led to a confusion of natures, attributing to God the Word such language as "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?" After this extraordinary sample of unfairness (which certainly tells badly for Theodoret), the writers appeal to eminent fathers, claim Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Thessaly, etc., as in accord with "the Orient," and assert that "Martinus," *i.e.* Martinian, bishop of Milan, had sent them a letter, and transmitted to Theodosius a copy of St. Ambrose on the Incarnation, "which teaches the contrary of those heretical articles." To this they add (by way of *tu quoque*) that Cyril's party have restored to their office men deposed for Pelagian or Euchite heresies, and have communicated with men excommunicate. They send to Rufus a copy of their "tome"—the document containing the Nicene Creed. Theodoret tells us that they also wrote to the bishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, and proved the Cyrilline articles to be full of Apollinarianism. We must needs admit that misrepresentations and unproved assertions were not a monopoly of the "Cyrillines" in this contest.

Theodoret had given up, almost entirely, his hope of gaining

the Emperor and the consistory, when he wrote to Alexander of Hierapolis. Everything had been tried; everything had failed. They could but trust in God. They had persevered, and would still hold on. But he sustained, with his brethren, a severe disappointment when Theodosius abruptly left Chalcedon, and thus overthrew all their hope of a sixth audience, and of a possible success in the matter of a doctrinal conference. They sent after him a remonstrance, or "contestatio," the first of three documents so called. In it they again declaim against the Cyrilline articles; refer, somewhat obscurely, to certain intrigues of Juvenal of Jerusalem in Phœnicia and Arabia; and conjure the Emperor, by the most sacred Names, not to let two different versions of Christian doctrine be current under his reign, and be transmitted, beyond the empire, into Persia. "God," they affirm, "will bring your mind to a clear apprehension of the question: we wish to be judged by your Piety; but, if you will not act thus, at least permit us to return home, for our cities are suffering from the machinations of the contentious." The Emperor, instead of paying attention to them, proceeded to take away all their hopes. He ordered the orthodox deputies to follow him to Constantinople, for the purpose of consecrating a new bishop in the place of Nestorius; while he did not give their opponents permission to leave Chalcedon. We can well understand how the tone of their second remonstrance, written after this mandate was made known, expressed the irritation of their feelings. "The Cyrilline party," they complain, "held a partisan synod at Ephesus, and confirmed Cyril's heretical articles; they also employed base means to strengthen themselves by new adherents. They ignored your orders sent through Count Candidian, through Palladius, and through Count John. He called us together four times, and they would never meet us for discussion. Here, too, they have played the same game; they have refused our challenge to fair debate; yet they have been allowed to officiate in the churches, while we have remained without *synaxis*" (which must mean the Eucharistic service) "both at Ephesus and here: nay, more, we have been in peril of personal ill-treatment, have been pelted by slaves disguised as monks. Now you have gone to the City" (Constantinople was for all Easterns "the City," as old Rome was for the West), "and have summoned thither these men accused of heresy—some of them condemned by us as heretics—in order that they might officiate there, and consecrate a bishop. You have neither invited us to follow you, nor permitted us to return

home: we remain at Chalcedon, in sorrow and in anxiety about an impending schism. We are constrained to warn you in the presence of God, of His Christ, of the Holy Spirit, that if a new bishop be consecrated before the right doctrine is re-established, there will be a schism throughout the Church. The Orient, and the provinces which in this matter stand by the Orient—Pontus, ‘Asia,’ Thrace, Illyricum, and Italy (for you have received a book of St. Ambrose contradicting this new doctrine)—will never accept Cyril’s teaching.” One marvels how they could claim as on their side the churches which recognised the primacy of Ephesus: when they speak of “Italy,” they must be understood to mean the northern part of it, regarded as subject to Milan.

Theodosius so far acceded to their request as to suffer them to go home. He put forth a brief mandate addressed to “the Council of Ephesus,” to this effect: “I have laboured for the Church’s peace; but since you cannot come to an union, and have not chosen to discuss the matter at issue, I order that the Council be dissolved, that the Orientals return to their churches, that Cyril shall enter into Alexandria, and Memnon remain at Ephesus. But understand that, while I live, I cannot condemn the Orientals; they have not been convicted of any offence in my presence. If you really wish for peace, write back to me; otherwise, go home immediately. *I* am not responsible for this mischief: God knows who are!” This curt and peremptory letter indicates that the refusal of the orthodox to discuss the question had impressed him unfavourably, although he thought it best practically to accept their conclusion against Nestorius. He had, indeed, previously signed a longer letter in which Cyril and Memnon were expressly spoken of as deposed; but Tillemont considers that this was “suppressed as soon as it was framed,” and certainly the imperial resolution must be found embodied in the shorter letter. The change of the Emperor’s mind in favour of the Cyrilline party is ascribed by Acacius of Bercea—not incredibly, as we shall see later—to bribes received by a chamberlain of the palace from Cyril’s nephew Paul, and also to the influence of a large number of monks. The Oriental deputies wrote to him a third and final letter, in which they declared that they had not expected such a result. “We,” they say, “have been modest and obedient; but our dutifulness has done us no good, but rather harm, so far as this world is concerned. Our enemies act as they like: we are only just allowed to go home. Yet you are our Sovereign as well as theirs: the Orient is no small portion of your

realm. You will need divine help in your African war" (*i.e.* in a meditated expedition in aid of the Western empire against the Vandals), "and you can only secure it by guarding the faith and preventing a schism. We must warn you of the danger; we dare not incur the penalty of those who 'give no warning;' we pray you not to suffer any innovations to be made on the Nicene faith: if you refuse to hear us, we will shake off the dust from our feet, and exclaim with Paul, 'We are free from the blood of all men!'" They wrote a melancholy letter to their friends at Ephesus, narrating the overthrow of their hopes, but promising to use every opportunity of helping the cause of "the most holy bishop Nestorius." Before the imperial letter could reach Ephesus, Cyril had departed for Alexandria, according to a note in the "Synodicon" appended to this final mandate. We are told that he entered Alexandria on the 3rd of Athyr, that is, on the 30th of October, 431, and was received by the city with a magnificent welcome.

His departure—which Acacius of Beroëa thought fit to describe as a flight—may be regarded as the final conclusion of the Council of Ephesus; but we must follow its deputies from Chalcedon to Constantinople, where they arrived somewhere about the end of September. Difficulties as to the election of a new archbishop of Constantinople might well have been foreseen. Philip of Side had a number of partisans; but Proclus, titular bishop of Cyzicus, had a larger number, and would have been elected but for the objection—in this case a purely technical one—against the translation of a bishop. Accordingly, the election of a third person seemed the safest course to take; and the aged priest Maximian, who had been instructed by St. Chrysostom, was chosen and consecrated. He was a man of ascetic life, neither eloquent nor skilled in practical business—preferring, says Socrates, a quiet life—but greatly esteemed for his piety, and for his munificence in constructing tombs for pious persons at his own expense. A letter which he wrote to Cyril after his consecration seems to show that he had a genuine devotion to "the cause of Christ,"—that his zeal against Nestorianism was intimately connected with his Christian piety. He had a difficult task before him when on Sunday the 25th of October he entered on his episcopate, receiving consecration from the Ephesian deputies and some other prelates.

The Orientals had lingered at Chalcedon, in hopes of making some impression on the court or on the people of Constantinople. But they found their position simply painful, and resolved to go home.

Before departing, Theodoret delivered a sermon, in which, after referring to Christ as having been Himself a sign to be spoken against, he declared that, although prevented from entering the imperial city, they were not excluded from the kingdom of heaven; indulged in a violent invective against the Cyrilline party under the titles of "rebellious children," "hatchers of serpents' eggs," and so forth; praised the zeal of Constantinopolitan sympathizers who had crossed the stormy Propontis to visit the friends of their banished pastor; and concluded by an eloquent but irrelevant outburst against the notion of a "passible Divinity." "Shall we believe that the Invisible, Uncreate, Infinite, Inscrutable One could suffer? God forbid. O our Saviour and Benefactor, let us never so apostatize from Thy worship, let us not so ignore Thy nature, let us not be so unthankful for Thy gifts, as to think that our Deliverer was passible!" Theodoret must have known that Cyril had distinguished carefully and clearly between the impassible Deity and the passible humanity in the one Christ; but he was just then blind to everything but party spirit, and party spirit with him was swollen into partisan fury. John of Antioch added a few words in a much more moderate tone, bidding his hearers farewell, assuring them that he and his colleagues would be still with them in spirit, exhorting them to hold fast the deposit of true faith, never to admit that the Deity could suffer, or that the Deity and the body could form one nature. We preach, he said, "a conjunction, an union—not a commixture." After these addresses the Orientals quitted Chalcedon.

CHAPTER XL.

THE REUNION OF CYRIL AND THE ORIENTALS.

THE state of matters at the dissolution of the Ephesian Council was still full of peril for the cause to which that assembly had devoted itself—the cause, to speak theologically, of the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union. Nestorius, indeed, was condemned; he was living in compulsory retirement; a new bishop, who agreed with Cyril and his adherents on the doctrinal question, had been enthroned at Constantinople. The sentence of deposition pronounced by the Council was thus effectively ratified, and the efforts of the “Orientals” to get it cancelled, and to secure their own sentences, fulminated against Cyril and Memnon, by obtaining for them imperial sanction, had been definitively baffled: Cyril was acknowledged by Theodosius, though in curt and unfriendly terms, to be in possession of the see of Alexandria. So far, the Council had triumphed. But it had not subdued the determination of the Oriental, Antiochene, or anti-Cyrrilline party, led by John of Antioch and Theodoret. That party had made up its mind on two points: (1) it would not acquiesce in the condemnation of Nestorius or in the substitution of Maximian; (2) it would not relax its hostility to the anathemas, or articles, of Cyril. On both these points its attitude was that of simple defiance. Maximian was, to them, a robber who had climbed into the sheepfold; Nestorius, a legitimate bishop uncanonically and tyrannically expelled; Cyril, an ambitious ecclesiastical despot, bent on the revival of the noxious Apollinarian heresy. “For the present,” they would say, “things are against us: the Emperor has been duped or wearied into injustice; three of the four great sees are in the hands of our opponents; there is a prevalent superstitious tendency which impels clerics and monks to confound the Godhead with the Manhood, or to absorb the Manhood

into the Godhead ; and Cyril's articles, as the expression of that tendency, are to be denounced and anathematized at all hazards and to all lengths. This is a position of trial and difficulty ; but in the interests of justice and true religion—for the sake of a person who represents, at this crisis, all sufferers for righteousness, and for the sake of all pure and worthy conceptions of the Divine nature, and of the relations between the Divine and the human elements in the Incarnation—we *must* hold out, we *must* fight on." Doubtless, among the many who looked to the bishop of Antioch as their leader and to the bishop of Cyrrhos as their theologian, there were minds as firmly convinced of the orthodoxy of their principles as Cyril could be of the religious momentousness of his own formulas. They ignored, with what to us may seem a culpable blindness, his explanations of what in these formulas had seemed to involve Apollinarianism ; yet party feeling too often means blindness to facts which incommode it, and the arbitrary line which Cyril and his friends had more than once adopted may well be thought to have put a stumbling-block in their path, while they earnestly dreaded anything like compromise on such vital matters as the reality of the Redeemer's Manhood. Their zeal was not, indeed, "according to knowledge," nor was it pure from personal animosities ; but it was a sincere zeal, nevertheless : and the more thoroughly we are convinced that the doctrine of the Personal Union, as defined at Ephesus and guarded by Cyril's explanatory language, was strictly essential to true Christian belief—that, had it been ignored or overborne, the Incarnation would have been evacuated of its true meaning, and the primeval faith in a really Divine Saviour have been virtually superseded and brought to nought—the more bound are we to do justice to the religious earnestness, the honest intentions, of many who could then hardly bring themselves to admit the phrase "Theotocos," and who could not read Cyril's articles without exclaiming against his "impious additions to the Nicene faith," his "profane advocacy of the Apollinarian superstition."

The Oriental deputies, on their way home from Chalcedon, arrived at Ancyra, and found to their disquiet that Theodotus the bishop, then at Constantinople, had, in conjunction with Maximian and with Firmus of Cappadocian Cæsarea, warned the Ancyrenes to treat them as excommunicate. In their turn, they, by the hand of John of Antioch, addressed to Antiochus the prefect a bitter invective against the "ex-bishops," the deposed heretics, who had ventured on such an outrage. "We do not own

them, nor him who has been made bishop by them, to be really bishops." From Ancyra they proceeded southwards to Tarsus. Cilicia had been the scene of Theodore's protracted episcopate, and his influence had moulded very largely the belief of the inhabitants; it was natural, then, for John to hold a Council at Tarsus, and synodical letters were drawn up, renewing the anathema against Cyril and the Cyrilline deputies "who went up in his behalf to Constantinople." The bishops also bound themselves again never to acquiesce in the deposition of Nestorius. They then went on to Antioch, and held another Council for the same purpose. John wrote a synodical letter to Theodosius, entreating him to proscribe the doctrine of Cyril's articles, as contrary to Scripture and to the Nicene Creed. He also wrote to the "duke" Appinianus in Mesopotamia, inveighing against the articles and their author. This happened, probably, about the end of 431; and soon afterwards John, Theodoret, and other bishops of their party visited the old bishop of Beroëa, and told him the story of their troubles and disappointments. Acacius wrote to his friend, Alexander of Hierapolis, that what had been said against the truth by the device of the devil exceeded all power of description; that Cyril's bribes had perverted the court; and that the Church's affairs needed for their amendment the interposition of Almighty power.

The Orientals were further incensed by the tidings of a new and important defection. They had reckoned the ancient seat of Christianity in Osrhoene, the "holy and blessed" city of Edessa, as among their strongholds. Rabbula, its honoured bishop, had now held the see for nineteen years; he had set an example of conspicuous self-devotion, although apparently combined with a certain amount of imperiousness; he had reclaimed from paganism a number of boys sent to study Syriac in the schools of Edessa, had turned a Jewish synagogue into a church of St. Stephen, and was among the adherents of John of Antioch at Ephesus. But, early in 432, he changed his opinions on the controversy, pronounced in his cathedral an anathema against the memory of Theodore, and against those who should read Theodore's books or even who should not bring them to be burned; it was also reported that he had begun to assert "one nature only in Christ," and to persecute those who taught otherwise. Andrew of Samosata learned these things by letters from friends at Edessa, shortly before the Easter, that is, about the end of March, of 432. "It

seems," he wrote to Alexander of Hierapolis, who upon all these points would feel intensely and speak vehemently, "to be our duty to fight openly against him, since he openly acts against true religion, and has cast off all the Orientals;" and ere long we find John of Antioch synodically warning the Osrhoenian bishops, suffragans of Rabbula, that, if what was rumoured of him were true, they must suspend communion with him until he had been personally examined at Antioch.

But now let us look back to the position of the orthodox or Cyriline party, as it shaped itself after the consecration of Maximian and the return of Cyril to Alexandria. Information as to Maximian's accession was sent as usual to the leading bishops, in the form of synodical letters. Maximian wrote in his own person to Cyril, beginning, "Your desires have been fulfilled, O most dear to God! you have been made a spectacle to angels and to men, and to all the priests of Christ. You have not only believed in Christ, but have suffered for Him." He begged Cyril "to strengthen him by his prayers, to instruct him by his counsels;" and again, "not to neglect to plead for him with Christ the Master." Cyril replied with great cordiality. He was careful again to assert the integrity of the manhood assumed by the Word; to deny all "fusion, such as many people talk of, or alteration of the Godhead,"—for the Incarnate, "even after He became man," remained what He was: He was the Same, the One: there was not one Son who was before the worlds, and another who was born of the Virgin, but one and the same; "we own that His body had a true rational soul, for we are not attached to the opinions of the insane Apollinaris; we anathematize him, and Arius, and Eunomius, *with* Nestorius." He congratulated the Constantinopolitans on having obtained a true pastor, an Eliakim in a Shebna's place.

Pope Celestine—one hardly understands why—did not receive the official account of Maximian's consecration till late in December, 432. Some two years before, as we know, he had quoted a Christmas hymn of St. Ambrose, as expressing the doctrine contended for by Cyril; it would be with a special pleasure that, amid the Christmas-day services at St. Peter's, he read out to his people the letter received from Constantinople. Again, however, one is surprised to find a delay that can hardly be accounted for. It was not until the 15th of March that Celestine wrote to the members of the Ephesian Council, expressing his joy

at Maximian's appointment. He had sympathized with them, he had in spirit acted with them, "when the sacred words were spoken over the new bishop's head." He regretted that the ex-bishop was allowed to live quietly at Antioch. Much had been done, but something still remained to be done for the good cause. He himself was "locally distant, but, by solicitude, could take a nearer view of all things:" he adds a Roman hint—"to St. Peter's care all alike were present." Let there be vigilant action against Nestorians: "although your sentence against them be read, yet *we* too determine what seems fitting. In such cases there are many things to be considered, which the apostolic see has always looked into"—another Roman assumption. "Let the actual chiefs of Nestorianism stand condemned: the others are to be treated as no longer bishops, unless, according to the decree of the Church and the Emperors, they will profess themselves Catholic prelates, by condemning what has been condemned. If John of Antioch is likely to come round, let him be summoned by letters, and warned that unless he condemns Nestorianism in writing, the Church will take his case also in hand." To Theodosius Celestine wrote with discreditable flattery, comparing him to Abraham, David, and Elijah, and exhorting him to remove Nestorius into solitary exile, that he might have no opportunity of ruining other souls. To Maximian he wrote a letter of affectionate sympathy and advice, referring to the storm which had not yet abated, and the difficult steering which he would have to perform; exhorting him to imitate "John" in preaching, Atticus in vigilance against heresy, Sisinnius in simple purity of life; and not forgetting to mention the necessity of resisting the condemned Cœlestian error. To the Church-people of Constantinople the Pope sent a turgidly expressed effusion of satisfaction at the victory of the truth. Nestorius was even worse than Judas, who did at any rate hang himself in remorse. His misbelief was too bad to be called "error;" let him be forgotten! Celestine declares that anxiety for the flock at Constantinople has given him sleepless nights; but all must acknowledge that it had been under the care of the Divine Shepherd. He referred in terms of eulogy to the zeal and writings of Cyril, who had striven to bring Nestorius back to the truth, and had used his talents so as to multiply them. He took care to allude to his own part in the matter—which, after all, had not been very great—as an instance of St. Peter's care, and dwelt on the deliberateness with which he had acted. After describing Nestorius's conduct in

first asking for a synod, and then declining to appear before it, he uses words which emphatically ascribe the final settlement to the General Council as such, "at last, the One Holy Spirit, living in all His priests, decreed what would be helpful to all:" and added somewhat more on the merits of Maximian, and on the duty of clinging to the true faith. In these letters, amid much of exultation, there is something which indicates the writer's perception of difficulties and troubles still attending the orthodox in Constantinople. There are, says Celestine to Maximian, waves that still rise high; there are those who stand aloof from the new bishop and from the orthodox Church.

Of these dissentients we have some notion from Theodoret's letters of sympathy; he had received letters, he writes, from the "afflicted adherents of apostolic doctrine" in Constantinople, and he felt for them as mother-birds might do for their fluttering brood when the nest had been attacked. He endeavoured to cheer them by scriptural examples of endurance, and accused the opposite party of virtually denying the Nicene faith, and incurring the Nicene anathema, which he quotes, by attributing sufferings to the Godhead, and so making the Divine Son "mutable." It is observable that he agrees with Cyril in using the original Nicene Creed, without the additions called Constantinopolitan. His own statement of belief, made in the same letter, is wholly clear of Nestorian error, and fully acknowledges the One Christ while ascribing to Him "two natures;" he affirms, as unequivocally as Cyril himself, the strict identity of Him who was Eternal with Him who was "descended from Abraham," and applies the term "temple" not, as Nestorius had done, to a supposed human individual, but to the Manhood assumed by the Word. We learn from another letter by Dorotheus, bishop of Marcianopolis, that the Nestorianizers of Constantinople had no priests, that some of them died without communion and some of their catechumens without baptism. But it appears that somewhat later they obtained the ministry of two or three priests, one of whom, Parthenius, was evidently quite orthodox as to the Personal Union.

A collision between the supporters of Maximian and the bishops who acknowledged Nestorius as still legitimately bishop was inevitable. Helladius of Tarsus would not accept the letter sent by Maximian on his accession, nor place Maximian's name upon the diptychs of his church. Maximian, indeed, was going rather far in writing to such a prelate; and after being rebuffed by him,

pronounced sentence of deposition against him (one more stretch of authority on the part of a bishop of Constantinople), and also against Eutherius of Tyana, Himerius of Nicomedia, and Dorotheus. Firmus of Cæsarea endeavoured to expel Eutherius, and consecrated a new bishop for Tyana. Some Isaurian soldiers were sent to help Eutherius; his people shut the city gates; and the new bishop declared that he had been consecrated against his will, and, by way of exhibiting his own disqualifications, had presently put on a cloak and gone to the theatre to await the performance of the games. Plintha, a general, escorted one Saturninus to Marcianopolis as its new bishop; but the people, especially on learning that Saturninus asserted "only one nature in Christ," barricaded themselves within the cathedral precinct, resorted (after the Milanese fashion) to psalms and hymns, and showed so resolute a front that Saturninus "departed as he had come." Theodoret mentions five bishops, called John, Peter, Elisha, Alphæus, Jephthah, who chose to be driven from their sees rather than disown Nestorius.

The spring of 432 thus witnessed the declared presence of a deplorable schism, with strifes, anathemas, persecutions, on all sides, involving both people and prelates, and provoking the scoffs of Jews and heathen. In the expressive language of Theodoret, "Although we are not only of one tribe, but of one womb, boasting of one Father, the God of all, and one mother, the most holy Font, yet nothing, neither our common share in the mystical Table, nor the fact that we are mutually hands and feet and eyes and make up one body, suffices to preserve the bond of concord." He, for his part, regarded Cyril with a bitterness which was but little in accordance with these regrets for a lost unity; and he wrote a new treatise, sometimes called the "Pentalogus," as being divided into five books, against the Cyrilline articles. Marius Mercator gives specimens of this work, which certainly contain Nestorianizing language. A number of short tracts ascribed to Theodoret by Photius are supposed to be by Eutherius of Tyana; and Andrew of Samosata wrote a treatise against Cyril, in his own name, and in a tone of much acrimony. On the other hand, Cyril set himself to remove the unfavourable impressions which Theodosius still retained as to his conduct; and the "Defence" which he addressed to the Emperor was well calculated to effect this object, being conceived in terms of profound respect, and containing distinct disavowals of any intention—such as had been imputed to him—of

sowing discord between Theodosius and Pulcheria. He described the controversy from his own standpoint, explained his own motives, dilated on the misconduct of John of Antioch, repelled the charges made against himself by disreputable Alexandrians, appealed to the Roman Church as testifying to his own orthodoxy, adduced the fact that his "letters" had been read in the Council and that the Council had pronounced him sound in the faith. He would have wished, he said, to be of the number of the deputies who went from the Council to Chalcedon; he would gladly have confronted John of Antioch, and met his charges point by point.

Such a letter was likely to have some influence on the mind of Theodosius. By his own account, he attributed the misfortunes of the Roman cause in Africa (for this is the meaning of an allusion in one of his letters) to the divisions of the Church; and even on general grounds he would naturally desire to bring about a peace between Cyril and at least some of the anti-Cyrrilline leaders. Accordingly he consulted Maximian, with some other prelates then at Constantinople, as to the means which might be taken for this end. "If John," they answered, "will sign the deposition of Nestorius and anathematize his teaching, no occasion of strife will be left; Cyril and Celestine will resume communion with John, and any other points in dispute will easily be settled." Theodosius, accordingly, wrote to John in the midsummer of 432, and also to Cyril, bidding them come to Nicomedia in all haste, attended only by a few clerics; they were expressly forbidden to bring any bishops with them, and were warned that they would not be allowed to see the Emperor's face until they had made up their quarrel. In the interval, no appointment or deposition of a bishop was to take place. The Emperor would not doubt that, for the sake of healing the unhappy schism, John and Cyril respectively would make any sacrifice of personal feeling; if they disappointed this confidence, they must blame themselves for the penalties which would follow. Theodosius also wrote to Acacius of Beroea, and to Symeon Stylites. Acacius was entreated to use his influence with John to persuade him to abandon Nestorius, against whose novel doctrines every one was contending. The Hermit-saint, who had within the last two or three years raised for himself a higher pillar—the third of three on which he passed his life after his first adoption of that extraordinary form of asceticism—was begged to pray for the reunion of John and Cyril. According to Liberatus, Cyril on his part received a letter from the bishops at

Constantinople, exhorting him, as a condition of peace, to withdraw his anti-Nestorian writings: but this must surely be an exaggeration; Maximian could not have ventured on such a proposal.

Theodosius's letter to John was entrusted to an imperial messenger, the "tribune and notary" Aristolaus, a man of high character, who gave the bishop of Antioch some preliminary warning as to his mission just before his arrival. John wrote, in anxiety, to Alexander of Hierapolis. He had heard that some plot was on foot to murder him on his journey; and he had learned that he was expected to anathematize those who affirmed two natures in Christ. Such an anathema, he added, would go beyond what even Cyril had dared to say. Would Alexander, with Theodoret and others, who were to assemble about that time at Cynrhos according to annual custom, hasten to Antioch as soon as their meeting should be over? They came as requested; a Council was held, and it was resolved that, *if* Cyril would condemn his own anathemas, the Orientals would communicate with him. Six short propositions were drawn up for his acceptance: the pith of them was contained, apparently, in one, which declared that the Nicene Creed, pure and simple, was to be taken as the one formulary of doctrine. Any other doctrinal statements, in letters or in articles, were to be cancelled—the only explanation of the creed which was to be recognised being that given by St. Athanasius, in his letter to Epictetus, bishop of Corinth, against the Apollinarian heresy; a letter which also clearly affirmed the actual identity of Christ with the Word or Divine Son. The deposition of Nestorius was, of course, not recognised by the Orientals; and they endeavoured, it seems, to shelve that question. A letter to this effect, written by Acacius or in his name, was addressed to Cyril.

Aristolaus had apparently received a new letter of instructions, dispensing with the personal attendance of the two prelates, and simply exhorting them to unite in spirit, if not by actual interview. Thus it was that, instead of aiding John to prepare for a journey to Nicomedia, the imperial agent undertook the task of carrying the Antiochene proposals to Alexandria. Cyril was not likely to embrace such terms as the Easterns offered. It was, he felt, absurd to ask him to retract what he had written in defence of the true faith under circumstances which would have made inaction criminal. The request was thus inadmissible. When Aristolaus urged him to make peace with John, he insisted

that he could not sacrifice his "articles," but protested, even with an imprecation, that they had been framed with no heretical meaning but out of pure zeal for the honour of Christ. He wrote back to Acacius, who, as he thought, had been over-persuaded to write the letter. The Nicene Creed, he declared, was as sacred and sufficient in his judgment as in the judgment of any man living. Nestorius had virtually contradicted it; was he now to be required to unsay what he had said in its defence against Nestorius? Let Nestorius be disowned and condemned; and then peace would be possible, would be certain. For himself, he anathematized Apollinarianism, and rejected all idea of a "confusion" or "conversion" in the mystery of the Incarnation; he maintained the absolute impassibility of the Divine nature; his articles had been aimed simply against Nestorius and had no other scope or meaning. When peace should be restored, he would gladly give yet further explanations. But how could he retract what had been so widely accepted? He must adhere to his position; the Council must be obeyed, Nestorius must be disowned, his heresy anathematized. He concluded by saying that his suffragans and clergy had keenly felt the wrongs done to him, but that Aristolaus had disposed them towards peace. He sent fraternal greetings to the bishops who were with Acacius.

This letter was conveyed to Acacius by a subordinate of Aristolaus, named Maximus; Aristolaus chose to remain at Alexandria, but he wrote to Acacius, exhorting him to urge John to condemn Nestorius. It would seem that Cyril wrote some three other letters to Acacius. There were thus various influences at this time brought to bear on the more moderate of the Orientals. At Rome, too, Celestine had died on the 26th of July, 432, and a new bishop had just been consecrated in the person of Sixtus III., whom we have met with in the Pelagian controversy. Cyril wrote to Sixtus to assure him that he did not insist on the condemnation of any individual except Nestorius, but hoped and wished that all the rest of the "shipwrecked" might be recovered: and the Pope in turn wrote to the Orientals, announcing his accession, and assuring them that Cyril was ready to forget all wrongs and all sufferings of a personal kind, and would make peace with John, and with all others except Nestorius, *if* they would disown Nestorianism, condemned as it was by the Council; he concluded by saying that although the matter had been definitely settled, the apostolic see could not be inactive, "having the care of all the Churches," and

being therefore, of course, solicitous for their welfare—another sample of the large and indefinite claims which popes put forward on the chance of their being admitted and thereby forming precedents.

Acacius now wrote to Alexander, speaking of Cyril's letter as doctrinally accurate, and asking him to express his sentiments upon it for the information of his brethren. The metropolitan of Hierapolis wrote back in stringent terms. He had been for years fighting against Apollinarianism; Cyril was reviving it: he might indeed profess to condemn it, but as truly might one who held the Son to be made out of nothing profess to reject Arianism. "When I am in God's road, I pay respect to no one! Cyril is a heretic: he says Christ has one nature; to that nature he attributes the Passion and the Death! If one reads candidly his articles, his Commentary on the Hebrews, his festal Epistles, his other writings, it will appear that he teaches this. If he does not, a word will settle it: let him own that Christ, the Virgin-born, the God-Man, suffered in His Manhood." Alexander proceeded to charge Cyril with evasiveness, as if, while owning the Word to be impassible, he had yet represented Him, not as having assumed passible flesh, but as having "become flesh," and so suffered, as having *become* passible. "Let him admit the two Natures; let him say, not, 'The Word suffered in flesh,' but, 'Christ suffered.' His phrase implies one nature only." Alexander concluded by offering to condemn Nestorius, if he could be proved to think contrary to Scripture. To Andrew he also wrote, expressing disgust at the "rapid change of mind" which he had observed in Acacius. "I prayed that the earth might swallow me up." Cyril's letter, he insists, is simply a reiteration of his heresy; he would rather cut off his right hand, pluck out his right eye, than make peace or act with others in making peace, while Cyril did not openly confess that Christ was both God and Man, and suffered in manhood, and was raised up by the power of God the Word. Andrew in his reply characterized Cyril's letter as containing some true statements of doctrine, but also some errors subtilly veiled. Why could not Cyril plainly assert two Natures? He proceeded to describe a dream which he had had, not long before: it is curious enough to be quoted. "I was with you and other bishops. You told me that Apollinaris was alive. 'Really?' I said. 'Yes, really.' At once we were beside a bed in which Apollinaris was lying; you whispered to me that we should not

win him over. Presently I saw John in bed, and Apollinaris giving him 'eulogiæ' or presents. I said, 'The concession which John has made is impious.' Then I awoke." Cyril's letter had also been sent by Acacius to Theodoret, who wrote briefly in reply, to this effect: "I see that Cyril has changed his opinions, and I praise Christ for it. But, for the rest, his letter is wordy and ambiguous: he evades accepting our propositions; and he requires us to sign the deposition of a man of whom we have not been the judges. This is out of the question; nor can we assent to any peace which is not well-pleasing to all." Theodoret also wrote to Andrew, that it was impossible to anathematize Nestorius's doctrines in the lump, "indiscriminately." Every godly man would be willing to condemn statements such as "There are two Christs," or "Christ is a mere Man,"—statements which he knew, of course, were said by Cyril to follow from Nestorius's language.

Here, then, was a clear difference emerging among the Orientals as to whether Cyril's doctrinal statements in his letter to Acacius were, or were not, clear of Apollinarianism. Andrew began to waver: he wrote to Theodoret that the Alexandrian's letter showed him to be as "rotten" as ever, but that perhaps Cyril would be content if only a certain number of the Orientals signed the deposition of Nestorius—a singularly poor and unworthy expedient. That some concession must be made he admitted; the suggestion of Theodoret, that they should anathematize the deniers of Christ's Godhead, or the dividers of the One Lord into two Christs, was adopted by him: but he showed his laxity of principle by coolly remarking in a letter to Alexander, "Even if we do, as a matter of economy, accept peace, we have no part with those who think impiously." What an instance of the fatal imposture of words, when diplomatic falsehood is made to pose as good "management"! Alexander was above such paltering; he wrote back that in Andrew's letter he saw a proof that Satan was desiring to sift them all. Nothing should induce him to call communicating with heretics "Christ's peace." No communion, no concession, no surrender, was his resolution; in this he protested he was governed solely by conscience, not by contentiousness nor ill-will. Theodoret wrote to him that Cyril *now* anathematized those who called the Godhead passible, or asserted a confusion of the two Natures. "Did he in his letter?" asked Alexander in return; "I cannot see it. His letter from first to last is a defence of his articles. If you and John think fit to make peace with him,

and if John betrays us all by an arrangement for peace' sake, I am clear of the blood of all men. As my God, the Lord of all, lives, better for my part the Oasis, or any remotest village, than communion with a heretic and with betrayers of orthodoxy!" Theodore answered this fiery outburst by gently observing that he himself, as John well knew, would never abandon Nestorius, but that Cyril's recent letter seemed to him clean contrary to his former heretical writings, and satisfactory as a disclaimer of Apollinarianism; he would gladly learn whatever lurked in it that was contrary to true doctrine. John had already indicated a disposition to accept Cyril's statements as a basis for negotiation; and by this he had angered not only Alexander but others, such as Maximin of Anazarbus, metropolitan of Cilicia Secunda, Helladius of Tarsus, and Eutherius of Tyana. Maximin had been "stupefied" with indignation at Cyril's letter; Helladius thought the proposal of peace with "the Egyptian" as bad as any heresy; Eutherius wrote to John that Cyril's letter contained much that was unsound, and proceeded to criticize the Cyrilline anathemas with a captiousness which perhaps resulted from confusedness of mind. Alexander, in reply to Helladius, denounced as heretical the letter of the "impious Cyril" to the "most holy Acacius," insisted that his real meaning should be scrutinized, and proposed that two or three Cilician bishops should visit "the Egyptian," and learn whether he was now really sound—whether, as some reported, he held what amounted to a negation of his articles; in which case, but in which case only, "let us communicate with him, embrace him, clasp his knees, omit nothing which can do him honour." In any other case they must contend for the true faith even unto blood. Theodore, although stigmatized by Alexander as a betrayer of the truth, persisted in thinking favourably of Cyril's recent language, and attended a Council of his province, the Euphratesian, at which it was resolved that the letter to Acacius was "in accordance with Church doctrine, *and* contrary to the twelve articles;" that if Himerius, the deposed bishop of Nicomedia, were reinstated, with the others who had been similarly deposed, it would be lawful to communicate with Cyril and Maximian; but that in no case should the deposition of Nestorius be approved. Thus, then, there were four shades of Oriental opinion as to the question of negotiations with Cyril. John and Acacius were most favourable to the idea; Theodore agreed with them in approving theologically of Cyril's

recent letter, but was very definite against abandoning Nestorius; Andrew disapproved of the letter, but felt that some negotiation was necessary; Alexander and three others were against all negotiation.

And now John, after consulting with Acacius, took a step towards peace which was destined to be effective: he commissioned Paul, bishop of Emesa, who had formed the most sanguine expectations from Cyril's letter, to go to Egypt and confer personally with Cyril. Paul had been one of the Eastern deputies sent to Chalcedon; but he was a warm-hearted and pious man, eager for Christian peace, a ready speaker, and of practical ability. Although elderly and in bad health, he gladly undertook the journey, and was supplied with certain documents. These were (1) the six propositions of the Oriental Council; (2) the doctrinal formulary drawn up at Ephesus by Theodoret, and intended for presentation to the Emperor, then withheld in deference to the extreme men of the Oriental party, and now again brought up for use, but with a judicious suppression of the introduction (save a few words) and of the conclusion which had reflected severely on Cyril's articles; (3) a letter for Cyril, in which John declared that the dissension between himself and his "brother" had arisen not from personal feeling—for, although they had never met, they had formerly been on specially friendly terms—but from the unfortunate publication of Cyril's articles. "Your Piety may be assured that they astonished me so much, that I could not believe they came from you; they seemed to me like the writings of a heterodox person. But," he added, "the harm done by them has to a great extent been undone; I hope, judging from your letter to Acacius, which has gladdened all lovers of Church peace, that it will be undone entirely." There were, he intimates, expressions in the letter which did not tend to peace, and further explanation was wanted—but it had been promised; and Cyril's adhesion to Athanasius's letter to Epictetus was thoroughly satisfactory. Let *him* be accepted as the interpreter of the creed. Let no efforts be wanting to heal the schism which has kindled throughout the Church a bitterness worse than "barbaric inhumanity"—bishops raging against bishops, laymen against laymen; "clouds of anathemas" floating all around; some, after the example of Apollinaris, calling their brethren "Jews," others "denouncing as pagans" those with whom perhaps they have often "received the ineffable mysteries." And there is no one who "grieves for the

affliction of Joseph" (Amos vi. 6), which supplies enjoyment to the enemies of Christianity. "I say this, not as blaming this party and acquitting that, but as attributing all to the confusion which has taken place for the sins of us all." John concluded his letter, which was in parts really dignified and pathetic, by requesting Cyril to receive with kindness and to confide in, as representing himself, the pious and intelligent bishop of Emesa, whom he sent to confer with Cyril as to the best means of restoring peace. "For your Piety ought to consider, not so much what refers to me or to yourself personally, as how stumbling-blocks may be removed, and the peace of the Church re-established." It is remarkable that John ignored altogether the questions raised as to the deposition of Nestorius, and as to the condemnation or rejection of his teaching.

John also endeavoured to mollify Alexander, not without some caustic allusion to the old prelate's passionate declaration about giving up everything for the cause of truth. "Such protestations were overstrained and needless; and as for the minute theological discussion in Alexander's letter to Acacius, Cyril had distinctly disowned Apollinarianism, by denying any confusion of the natures and owning the impassibility of the Godhead. This was explicit: well would it be if Alexander's neighbours" (meaning Rabbula and his friends) "and those beyond Mount Taurus" (meaning Firmus and others) "would say as much! Cyril's new assertions were contrary to his own articles, and involved a virtual retraction of past errors. You say you are crucified to the world: that is very well as regards you, but nothing to the purpose as to the world; there is no call, just now, for philosophic self-sacrifice or for martyrdom." This letter made no impression on Alexander. "No one," he wrote in answer, "could see his way to calling Cyril *now* orthodox. Cyril did not admit two natures in Christ; he did not own that Christ was Man as well as God, and that for ever; his admissions of the impassibility of the Godhead were illusory, for he went on to say that the Word, the Only-begotten, suffered in the flesh." Under these circumstances, he could not entertain the idea of peace; while if John were content with Cyril's letter, what was the use of despatching Paul to Cyril? This letter was the last that Alexander would write to John upon the subject. Nestorius, he knew, had taught in his sermons what was taught in Scripture: one might well stop one's ears at hearing the impious Cyril propose that such teaching should be

anathematized as a condition of communicating with him. It was as much as to say, "You shall have my communion, if you too will become heretics." To this specimen of the old Nestorianizer's temper and insight the patriarch of Antioch replied with quiet dignity: "I thought I had begun something useful; but since you denounce parts of my letter as bad, the rest as senseless, I had better say no more about yours. Paul has started on his journey: I beg you not to treat it as needless. Probably he will obtain some concession, for conversation often removes difficulties; if not, we shall have to take further counsel."

We must now follow Paul to Alexandria. Cyril received him cordially, as soon as his own health would allow him to do so, for he was very unwell, as his archdeacon tells us, when Paul arrived. When he recovered sufficiently to transact business, Paul found him, as he himself afterwards testified, "kindly and pacifically disposed, and as became a bishop:" they talked over the matter amicably, but, as Cyril says, deliberately and carefully. The main question, of course, was that of doctrine. Paul presented to Cyril the doctrinal statement which he had brought with him. "It was drawn up," he said, "by John and by his brother prelates." He spoke in behalf of John, who had commissioned him to exhibit it as an exposition of the Incarnation, framed in common by the Eastern bishops. In place of the preamble, which, as we have said, had been almost entirely suppressed, a new and very short introduction had been prefixed as follows: "We will briefly state, not making addition to the faith, but for full satisfaction—as we have received from the beginning out of the divine Scriptures and out of the tradition of the holy fathers, and as we hold—how we think and speak as to the Theotocos, Mary the Virgin, and the manner of the Incarnation of the Only-begotten Son of God." Then the introduction dwelt on the sufficiency of the Nicene Creed, and deprecated, as the first edition (so to speak) of the formulary had deprecated, all attempts to penetrate to the bottom of the mystery,—thus confronting, after the manner of Athanasius and other fathers, the imputation of intruding into things unseen. Then followed the formula itself, which we must read in its entirety.

"We confess, then, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, perfect God, and perfect Man of a rational soul and a body; before the ages begotten of the Father as to the Godhead, but in the last days, the Same, for us and for our salvation,

(born) of Mary the Virgin as to the Manhood: the Same Co-essential with the Father as to the Godhead, and also Co-essential with us as to the Manhood: for there took place an union of Two Natures: wherefore we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. According to this conception of the Union (as) without confusion, we confess the holy Virgin to be Theotocos, because God the Word was incarnate and made man, and from the moment of conception united to Himself the temple that He derived from her."

To this statement was added, in place of the original peroration, the following:—

"As to the phrases of evangelists and apostles about our Lord, we know that theologians make some of them common, as referring to one person, and distinguish others as applying to two natures, and among the latter, explain the terms which are appropriate to Deity with reference to Christ's Godhead, and those which indicate humiliation with reference to His Manhood."

This formulary, as now presented to Cyril, was somewhat different from the phraseology which he had been in the habit of using, in that it dwelt more explicitly on the distinctness of the Manhood from the Godhead—on the twofold aspect, so to speak, of the Incarnation. But, as he afterwards said, to acknowledge the difference of the natures, united without confusion in the single "hypostasis" of the Incarnate Lord, was not to divide the one Christ into two; and to say, as this confession said, that some of the scriptural expressions about Him had reference to His Deity, others to His humanity, and others to Him as both divine and human, was not to deny that they all alike supposed the action of His one person—which was precisely what had been denied by the heresy condemned at Ephesus. Before the Council, Cyril in his reply to the Orientals had recognised two classes of such sayings, appropriate respectively to the Godhead and to the Manhood; but, he had added, "we insist that both classes refer to the one Jesus Christ;" and so after the Council, in his "Explanation" of the articles, "We assign to one person all the sayings (of Christ) in the Gospels, both the human and those which befit the Divinity." And the formulary expressly safeguarded the personal oneness of the Lord. Waiving, therefore, any considerations derived from his own personal habits of theological speech, Cyril accepted the formulary as orthodox, and placed a corresponding declaration of his belief in the hands of Paul. And thus, as he afterwards expressed it, he terminated the discussion about the faith "more

expeditiously than, perhaps, Paul had expected, causing him no difficulty at all, but remembering the Divine words, 'My peace I give unto you.'"

So far, the two bishops found that they were really at one on the question which was fundamental. They proceeded to talk over the past transactions, and the events at Ephesus furnished matter for long conversations; but they both at last agreed to "forget" them, and to go on to what was of more importance. "Have you," asked Cyril, "brought me a letter from John?" "Yes, here it is;" and he presented the letter already described. Cyril, however, was by no means content with it. He thought it irritating rather than conciliatory: his sensitive temper could not brook the tone, however gentle and measured, in which John had regretted the promulgation of his articles; and he had expected, as he says, some excuse or apology for the acts done against him at Ephesus, instead of which there was, in his opinion, fresh matter of offence. Paul protested with an oath that no offence had been intended; and Cyril accepted this assurance. But, on the other hand, he could not omit the point which John had hoped to evade. Would John and his friends accept the deposition of Nestorius and anathematize Nestorianism? Paul was in a difficulty, but he endeavoured to meet it by saying, "*I* am ready to do this, in writing, and in the name of my brethren." Cyril answered promptly, "A document of this kind, signed by you, commits you only: if you sign it, I will admit you personally to communion; but if communion is to be resumed between Alexandria and the Orientals, John must himself sign a similar paper." Paul accepted these terms. He made one more attempt at a compromise. Peace, he said, was impossible unless the metropolitans who had been deposed as partisans of Nestorius were recognised again as lawful possessors of their sees. Here, again, he met with a firm refusal. "What you are asking," said Cyril, "is simply impossible; I will never agree to it." Paul saw that he must not press the matter; and all that remained was for him to draw up a document in the form of a letter to Cyril, in which, as he expressed it, he personally declared to Cyril that he accepted the consecration of Maximian, regarded Nestorius, "sometime bishop of Constantinople," as deposed, anathematized his impious doctrines, and embraced in all sincerity the communion of Cyril, in the sense of that exposition of the faith concerning the Incarnation which he had presented to Cyril, and which Cyril had accepted as his own.

All difficulty as to the communion of Paul with Cyril being now at an end, Cyril admitted Paul to join in the Church service, probably on the Sunday before Christmas, December 18th, 432. Paul was allowed to address the people: he said a few words about the blessing of peace as Christ's gift to the world, and was careful to observe that he had but partially brought peace to Alexandria, meaning that he had not been able to answer for all the Orientals on the question of the position of Nestorius. But on Christmas Day, in the great church, and in Cyril's presence, Paul preached a regular sermon, beginning with a reference to the Angelic hymn, and proceeding to the birth of "the Emmanuel," whence he inferred that His Mother Mary was Theotocos. A shout of applause, such as was common in Eastern congregations, broke forth. "Lo, this is the Faith! God's is the gift, orthodox Cyril! this is what we sought to hear! Anathema to him that thinks otherwise!" Paul took up the anathema. "He who says not, means not, thinks not this, is anathema from the Church. So, the Theotocos Mary brought forth for us the Emmanuel—God incarnate." He went on to speak of the Incarnate as having assumed our nature (using the word *physis*) "in its entirety, and so proceeded from the Theotocos, perfect God, and at the same time perfect Man." Then came the momentous words, intended to secure that side of the truth for which the Orientals had contended. "For a combination of two perfect natures constituted for us the one Son, the one Christ, the one Lord." Again the joyful cries arose, "Welcome, orthodox bishop, worthy guest to worthy host! Christians say, 'Tis God's gift, orthodox Cyril!" "I knew," resumed Paul, "that I was come to an orthodox father." He went on to condemn those who spoke of two Sons or regarded the Emmanuel as merely the most holy of prophets or saints; and concluded by dwelling on St. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi, and referring to true faith as the "rock" of the Church. On the following Sunday, January 1st, 433, Paul preached a second and longer sermon, in which he took care to call Christ "co-essential with men as to His Manhood," a point insisted on by the Orientals, and to assert the impassibility of His Godhead as consistent with His personal appropriation of passible flesh. He dwelt upon the eternity of the Word, inferred from St. John's prologue that there were two natures in the one Incarnate Person, and recurred to the twofold truth that the Word Himself remained impassible, although at the same time the Body that suffered was His own. "This doctrine," he concluded, "is

your father's, is your ancestral treasure; it was the doctrine of Athanasius and of Theophilus: but as you have listened to my babblings, now listen to your father's voice," which he compared to the trumpet in contrast with the shepherd's reed. The people again applauded. Cyril added a few words, simply affirming the Incarnation and its purposes; and thus the visit of Paul to Alexandria came to its end, having done all that could be done by such an expedient.

The question now remained, Would John and his friends confirm Paul's acts? A considerable time had elapsed since he went to Alexandria; and John, on his side, was evidently slow to abandon Nestorius, for he wrote to Paul, saying that the Oriental bishops would not allow the matter to go further, and sending some extracts from writings of Nestorius. This angered Aristolaus, who was very eager for the reunion, and he wrote sharply to John. News came immediately afterwards of an Oriental Council having met at Antioch, and of a bishop being sent from it to Alexandria as the bearer of its decrees. At Constantinople, too, matters were questionable; and Cyril deemed it expedient to write to the Augusta Pulcheria, to officials of the court, even to court ladies, to bespeak their influence and to offer "eulogiae" or presents—a proceeding which moves the austere Tillemont to say, "Cyril is a Saint, but one cannot say that all his acts are saintly, and the holiest men have reason to dread the temptation which leads us to think anything lawful whereby a holy enterprise may be made to succeed." It was Cyril's old fault—his readiness to use "the world's coarse thumb" for what he deemed the necessary work of the Church. Maximian was languid, as Cyril thought, in the cause; he had written in a tone which seriously vexed both Cyril and Aristolaus and had even produced a return of Cyril's illness; and Epiphanius, archdeacon of Alexandria, wrote to the "archbishop and father of fathers," complaining of his non-fulfilment of certain promises, and exhorting him to bestir himself at the court to counterwork Nestorius's intrigues, to beg Pulcheria to write "peremptorily" to John of Antioch that he should no longer mention Nestorius at the Eucharist, and to enlist in the same cause the authority of the monastic chiefs, Dalmatius and—one meets here, for the first time, a sadly memorable name—"the holy Eutyches."

Cyril found that Paul and Aristolaus were annoyed at his declining to write a letter to John: he accordingly waived his own

opinion that it was for John to write first and satisfy him on the question of Nestorius ; and he drew up, in conjunction with Paul, a paper which John was to be asked to sign, and also a letter of communion which was to be given to John as soon as he had signed the paper, but not otherwise. Aristolaus and Paul, with two Alexandrian deacons, were to go to Antioch ; and Aristolaus promised with an oath that the paper to be signed should be conveyed in safety. "And," he added, "if John refuses to sign, I will go straight to Constantinople, and tell the Emperor that the one obstacle to peace is *not* the Church of Alexandria, but the bishop of Antioch." John offered no further obstacle. He received the paper, made in it some slight verbal alterations, not affecting the sense but softening the tone, with the consent of Aristolaus ; and then formally accepted and signed it, abandoning Nestorius and anathematizing his doctrine. The bishops then at Antioch concurred with him in this step ; and thus the main difficulty in the way of an entire reunion was annihilated. John wrote to Sixtus, Cyril, and Maximian a circular letter, in which, after dwelling on the evils of dissension and on the urgent injunctions of the Emperor in favour of peace, he and those who were with him declared that they agreed with the sentence of the "holy Council of bishops at Ephesus" against Nestorius, regarded him as deposed, anathematized his unhallowed teachings, inasmuch as (this clause was significant) *their* Churches had ever held the right faith ; that they assented to the consecration of Maximian, "bishop of the holy Church of Constantinople ;" and that they were in communion with all the bishops throughout the world who held and kept the right faith. To Cyril John wrote two special letters. In the first he said that it seemed needless to go into the whole subject of past disputes ; and after reciting the doctrinal formula agreed upon between Paul and Cyril, he gave assurances, as in the circular, about his acceptance of the sentence on Nestorius, his condemnation of Nestorian "novelties," and his recognition of Maximian. "Farewell," he concludes, "and pray for us continuously, most pious lord, and to me, above all men, most true brother." The other letter to Cyril is still more cordial. "We have regained each other, my lord, by the favour of God, and the intervention of bishop Paul." Recurring to the affectionate language in which he had signified to Cyril his speedy journey towards Ephesus (rather a delicate point to touch), John expressed on his own behalf and on that of "all the Oriental bishops" (a phrase

in the use of which he was somewhat premature) a warm regard—the restoration, in fact, of an old friendliness—for the “dear and honoured person” of his Alexandrian brother. Cyril’s two deacons, who had carried his documents to John, were charged with the duty of explaining to Cyril why John had ventured to omit a few syllables in the paper presented to him, not with any unfair purpose, but solely as a matter of policy, and in order to a practical settlement of the question in view of the circumstances of the Antiochene Church—*i.e.* so as to soften opposition on the part of his suffragans.

Paul returned to Alexandria with the deacons; and Cyril, who had been too ill to go to church in the February of that year in order to announce the day to be kept as Easter Sunday, was well enough to take his full part in the conclusion of the negotiations. Paul earnestly asked him whether he accepted the letter of Athanasius to Epictetus, which had already been sent to him from Antioch. “Certainly, I accept every word of it,” answered Cyril: “but is your copy of it free from corruption? Heretics have tampered largely with the text.” Paul produced a copy: “I should like,” he said, “to compare this with your copies.” They set to work at this task; and Paul found that the Alexandrian text was different from that which his manuscript exhibited. “Let me then,” he said, “have a number of correct copies made from your text, and I will take them to Antioch.” Cyril proceeded to write the famous letter, apparently synodical, and certainly most momentous in its results, known by the first words of its Latin version as *Lætentur cœli*. Let us read the substance of it, as if we heard it read out by Cyril’s orders in the great church of Alexandria, on the 28th of Phamenoth, *i.e.* the 23rd of April, 433. The “pope” has said a few words, or perhaps has preached a sermon of which a few words remain, likening an orthodox and pious soul to “rich land,” and adding that Nestorius, as one of the tares, has been cast out from every church. “The Oriental prelates,” he adds, “have acknowledged the right faith; and the letters of the most pious John, bishop of Antioch, addressed to me, and my answer to him, will now be read to you.” The deacon stands forth, reads John’s letters, and then, while the expectation and interest are at their height, begins the first sentence of Cyril’s reply: “Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad, for the middle wall of partition is broken down.” After referring to Paul in laudatory terms, and reciting the formula of Reunion, Cyril

expressed his delight at finding that there was such agreement between the Orientals and himself. He proceeded again to disclaim Apollinarianism; he had been charged by "waspish" enemies with ascribing a heavenly origin to "the holy body of Christ." To do so would have been contradictory to his whole contention for the term Theotocos; and if the Second Man, the Son of Man, was said to be "from heaven," that was because the Word who came from heaven had assumed the form of a servant, and was perfect in manhood as in Godhead; the difference of the natures which were united in His person not being ignored, while that personality was conceived of as One. Nor could there be any fusion of the Word with flesh, simply because He could not be changed; nor could He, in Himself, suffer, although He "attributed to Himself," by an "appropriation," the sufferings of that Manhood which He had made His own. Cyril assured John that he adhered immovably to the "inspired" creed of the Nicene fathers, and would not go a step outside the line of the teaching of Athanasius: if any words of his had been perverted from their true meaning, that was not his fault; and he concluded by asking John's attention to the correct transcripts of the epistle of Athanasius to Epictetus, which were to accompany the present letter. Such was the third of Cyril's three principal letters, the other two being his second and third to Nestorius. It was frequently read and quoted as a great doctrinal authority, and received the solemn applause of the Council of Chalcedon: "We all thus believe: eternal remembrance to Cyril!" He wrote, in great exultation, to pope Sixtus and to Maximian, informing them of the peace thus concluded between himself and those who were represented by John. His prayer, he said, had come up before the Lord; no longer was there any strife, no longer any difference of aim; the Saviour had stilled the storm of discord, thanks, in great measure, to the prayers of those orthodox believers, such as Maximian, who worshipped Him in spirit and in truth.

Before Paul set out on his second return-journey, he wrote to John, and told him of the settlement which had been reached. John was delighted by such good news, and wrote to Theodoret in an effusion of gladness. The distinctness of the natures had now been acknowledged; Cyril had spoken with all possible accuracy on the point of doctrine: what remained but to rejoice over the restoration of Church unity? When Paul arrived, John wrote to Sixtus to announce the Reunion, and also to Theodosius,

professing his abandonment of Nestorius, but requesting that the bishops deposed for adhering to him might be reinstated; it is observable that he spoke of such a measure as within the Emperor's sole prerogative. To the Oriental bishops he sent a circular, informing them all that his brother-prelate of Alexandria had clearly and unequivocally satisfied him on the doctrine in question, accepting his formulary and giving in return an equivalent statement. There could now be no doubt whatever of the entire agreement of Egypt with the Orientals as to the difference of Christ's natures and the unity of His person. They would judge of this for themselves, for they would receive copies of Cyril's letter and of his own letter to Cyril: nothing, therefore, had to be done except to embrace and to maintain the union thus established.

But would it be embraced by all the Orientals? John must have had reason for much anxiety on this point. First, there was Theodoret: he had a keen personal dislike to Cyril, a bitter recollection of what he considered the wrongs done to Nestorius, a determination never to abandon his cause. He did not object to Cyril's recent doctrinal statements—on the contrary, he thought them satisfactory; but the articles of Cyril ought, in his opinion, to be definitively condemned and retracted, and Cyril, he knew, would not consent to anything like this. The case of the deposed friends of Nestorius was also, to him, of primary importance; it would be no true peace if their interests were sacrificed; he especially mentioned Himerius of Nicomedia as complaining that he had been betrayed, and exhorted John to reassure him. Then there were others whose aversion to the Reunion was of a yet stronger kind. Alexander thought the letter of Cyril as heretical as his former writings. There was no ground for thinking that Cyril had amended his opinions: John had made peace with the "impious" Egyptian, and was trying—in his usual manner—to hoodwink men whose eyes and ears were their own, and who knew how the case really stood; and he replied to John, in accordance with these violent sentiments, by a memorial in which he forbore to call him "bishop," and even renounced his communion. He wrote to Andrew to inform him of this. To Theodoret he declared that he would die a thousand deaths rather than join in such an union: the phrase Theotocos might be justified if rhetorically used, even although the qualifying term Anthroptocos or Christotocos were omitted; but when Theotocos was

dogmatically put forward as *the* doctrinal term, without any term that could express the "perfect manhood"—*i.e.* without Anthropotocos or Christotocos—then, said Alexander, it conveyed a heretical meaning. Theodoret himself regretted that Theotocos alone had been employed in the Formulary, and that the propositions formerly drawn up at Antioch had been shelved. He proposed a meeting of bishops at Zeugma or at Hierapolis: would Alexander write to that effect to Andrew? Andrew was satisfied with Cyril's last statements; and he was persuaded that peace was necessary, if the Church was to hold up her head against Jews and heathens. But, like Theodoret—who, however, was less disposed towards peace than he was—Andrew meant to do nothing against the position of "the most holy bishop Nestorius." Alexander refused to come to the proposed Council, unless Theodoret could ensure a condemnation, on John's part, of Cyril's articles, and a steady resistance to all measures against Nestorius. "On these two points," he said, "bishop John is a scandal to me. He has betrayed the faith, and condemned the man whom he knows to be orthodox." The intractable metropolitan of Hierapolis was thus absent from the conference at Zeugma. Andrew, John of Germanicia, and Theodoret met, and recognised Cyril as now orthodox in virtue of his recent letter, which they viewed as incompatible with his articles. But they could not acquiesce in the demand that they should anathematize Nestorius; they accordingly wrote to John, asking whether this demand were really made—a somewhat embarrassing question, considering that, as this letter said, John had promised never to enforce such a demand. Such was the position of Theodoret and his friends. Alexander kept no terms with them, and wrote letters almost incoherent with excitement and wrath. "Cease, I beg, to admonish me. You have hastened after the lost sheep"—meaning, ironically, himself—"but it does not choose to be found. For the future, be quiet. We shall assuredly meet each other before that awful judgment-seat." "I could not attain your profound insight into the mystery of the Egyptian's repentance. . . . You will fail to persuade me, for I am not in a hurry to lose the deposit which Christ has entrusted to me." He wrote letters against his old friends for communicating with John, the traitor and renegade; he accused Andrew of having an interview with Rabbula; and he found supporters in Euphratesia, the Cilicias, Cappadocia, and elsewhere. The bishops of Cilicia Secunda held a synod at Anazarbus, and proclaimed

that they held Cyril to be a deposed ex-bishop, and were out of communion with those who had resumed communion with him when he had not given satisfaction by anathematizing his articles. Until that should take place, "fire and sword, and the teeth of wild beasts," should not make them communicate with Cyril or with those who recognised him as an orthodox bishop. Eutherius and Helladius were so absurd as to appeal to Rome for sympathy: probably they relied on rumours of Sixtus's favourable disposition towards Nestorius; but one would think they must have known of the part which Sixtus had lately taken in favour of the Reunion. However, they gave him an account of the whole Nestorian struggle; complained of the arbitrariness with which they had been commanded, apart from discussion, to condemn Nestorius; and commented severely on what they called "the senseless changeableness and manifest traitorousness" of John of Antioch, who, after all that he had done against Cyril, now in his sole person loosed the bond which he, in company with such eminent men, had laid on Cyril and Memnon, "and anathematized, not this or that saying of Nestorius, but, indiscriminately, whatever he had impiously said."

Here, then, was a complication of the old trouble. John was reconciled to Cyril; so were most of his friends; but two sections of the Oriental party held aloof. Alexander and the "irreconcilables" thundered against John and Cyril, against all reunion until the Cyrilline articles should be anathematized. Theodoret, and with him a few others, refused to join in the reunion until the condition imposed by Cyril, "Abandon Nestorius," were cancelled. But Andrew went over from Theodoret's position to that of John, and formally announced to Alexander's Church stewards that he recognised Cyril's last letter as orthodox, and was in communion with him, believing in one person of Christ and two natures, the union being without confusion. "If," he wrote, "Alexander does not choose to be at peace with Catholics, like a Catholic, I shall be sorry that this is his mind; but God is the Judge of all men." Andrew gave up, at the same time, all urgency in behalf of Nestorius; in short, he frankly joined the Peace-party. John, who was vexed at the resistance with which he was met, invoked the secular power, endeavoured to procure an imperial order enforcing communion with Antioch on all Oriental bishops, called on Alexander, in the Emperor's name, to forbid his suffragans to visit the court, and went so far as to

supersede him in his functions and to consecrate new bishops in dioceses of which Alexander was metropolitan. This despotic conduct provoked Theodoret to renounce communion with John, and to draw nearer to Alexander. But the stern pressure of the government was too much for most of the recalcitrants. Maximin of Anabazus, perforce, gave in, so did Helladius, so ultimately did Theodoret; but they would not anathematize the teaching of Nestorius nor assent to his deposition. However, said Theodoret, John had only anathematized "whatever Nestorius thought or said contrary to apostolic doctrine." The more Theodoret inclined towards concession, the more he tried to carry Alexander with him; but he failed. At last he made peace with John, but, in doing so, acted up to a letter in which he had assured Nestorius that while he acknowledged Cyril's letter to be "free of heretical bitterness, he did not hate the writer less, and would not assent to the proceedings against Nestorius, even if they were to cut off both his hands." Thus the Reunion triumphed, but at the cost of the ejection of some six bishops and the abdication of six others. Alexander, of course, was expelled, and was banished to one of the Egyptian mines in the spring of 435.

Before proceeding to the last measures taken against Nestorius and Nestorianism, we must return to the difficulties which the Union had to encounter on the side of the old friends and supporters of Cyril. He was supposed, by some, to have made concessions to Nestorianism in his last letter. This representation of the case was made from two opposite quarters. First, the Nestorianizers proclaimed that Cyril had come round to their view—that he had given up his former opinions; some of them even showed a letter as from Cyril, in which he was made to express regret for what he had done at Ephesus: of this figment Cyril said scornfully, "By the grace of our Saviour I am in my right mind." But there were also anti-Nestorians, old friends of Cyril, who were perplexed or scandalized by what they thought his undue concessions to the Oriental school of theology. Isidore of Pelusium, as we have seen, had administered to him, in 431, a warning against arbitrary and violent conduct—a warning not wholly undeserved; but he now thought Cyril inclined to something like inconsistency and time-serving, and wrote to him accordingly. "You will be accused either of flattery or of levity. You ought to remain steadfast." Many, in fact, who really held what Cyril held, and no more, were so anxious about the doctrine of the

Hypostatic Union that they dreaded even the appearance of a compromise, and thought they saw such an appearance, or even more than an appearance, in the conduct of their leader towards John. Hence Cyril found it necessary to explain the Reunion formulary, as he had previously explained the Twelve Articles, and to show that it was consistent with the position he had all along held. Others there were among the Cyrilline party who carried the Alexandrian theology to an extreme, and were virtually preparing the way for the Monophysite heresy. Among them, apparently, was Acacius of Melitene. "Think, I beg of you," he wrote, "of the interests of every church alike. Either personally or by deputies, see that those be anathematized who say there are Two natures, each operating in its own way, after the union of Godhead and Manhood in Christ. Some in Germanicia will not say 'two Sons,' but will say 'two natures;' but two natures, thus operating, mean two Sons, and nothing short of it."

Thus it is that we have to consider some letters in which Cyril defended the Reunion against the criticisms or apprehensions of those who had striven with him against Nestorius. Let us take his letter to Acacius first. After narrating what had really taken place, he refutes the cavil started by Nestorian critics of the Formulary, that it is in fact a "new symbol;" and in so doing he shows that he understands the Ephesian prohibition of "a different exposition of faith" as excluding any other creed "than the one now existing," with which, as with Scripture, he professes himself "content;" in other words, he does not recognise that interpretation which excludes only a difference of purport or idea and allows a difference of language. Next, he describes the essence of Nestorianism as consisting in the representation of the Christ as an individual man, a human person, "connected" with the Divine person of the Word, so that virtually it asserted two Christs. Then he shows the difference between this view and the view of the Orientals, as now represented by Paul and by John of Antioch. *They* confess the Virgin to be Theotocos; they identify the eternal Son with Him who was born of her; they profess their belief that He was at once co-essential with the Father as to Godhead, and with men as to manhood, which of itself implied that He was Himself both God and Man. Then as to the phrase "*two natures*:" in thought, says Cyril, we speak of two, that is, they are to be conceived of as two, "but after they are united, in that the separation into two" (he means two beings or two

personalities) "is annulled, we believe the nature of the Son to be one, as of one (person), but of (a person) incarnate;" and further on, "The nature of the Word is confessedly one, but it is, we know, incarnate." "The sense in which the distinction of natures or hypostases" (observe this) "is to be taken, is, that the Deity and the humanity are not the same in natural quality" (*poiotes*). "Consider the Incarnation, and the mind sees two things united to each other ineffably and without confusion, but does not separate them when united," that is, does not view them as existing in two personal beings. "In regard to the distinction between classes of texts, the Orientals do not apply some texts to a Divine Son by Himself, others to a human Son by himself, but some to the Godhead, others to the Manhood, and others to both the Godhead and the Manhood, but of the same God-Man." He proceeds to say that an expression imputed to him by John, "I confess the difference of the natures, and divide the texts between the natures," is not his, but John's mode of explaining that (as was the fact) Cyril recognised our Lord as speaking sometimes in a Divine tone, and sometimes in a human, being Himself both God and Man.

To Eulogius, a priest resident at Constantinople, Cyril wrote a similar letter. Some wonder, he says, that I can have tolerated a formulary which speaks of "Two Natures." "Well, *is* that phrase really Nestorian? that is, does it involve Nestorian heresy? Nestorius used it—but not all statements of heretics are heretical. It is with Godhead and Manhood in Christ as with body and soul in man: they are different natures, but we view them as united in man, and thus they make up one nature of man." Here we have the celebrated illustration adopted in the "*Quicumque*:" it had been used in the third letter to Nestorius, in the treatise against Nestorius, in the "*Explanation*," and had not yet been "*wrested*," as Waterland says, by Monophysites and thereby rendered questionable in the eyes of Catholics. "*We say 'one nature incarnate of God the Word.' I conceded the use of 'two natures,' and of 'co-essential with us as to manhood,' because, although the phrases may be somewhat obscure, they mean what is true, that is, that no confusion of natures took place: the Word was the Word, and flesh was flesh; a body cannot be co-essential with the Word, therefore there must be one nature and another. When these two elements were once united in the Incarnation, they were never again separate*" (*i.e.* in two personalities), "*but there is one Son, and one nature of Him, as of the Word Incarnate.*"

He proceeds to draw out briefly the essential differences between Nestorianism and the Formulary, *e.g.* that the Formulary, while distinguishing the attributes, assigns them all to one Christ; and he concludes with orders to Eulogius as to the distribution of certain letters in Constantinople. We must here observe that in maintaining the phrase "one nature (*physis*) of the Word, (though) a nature incarnate," Cyril deemed himself to be quoting St. Athanasius, for a short tract containing the phrase was commonly supposed to be a work of that great father, whereas a friend of Apollinaris, quoted by Leontius of Byzantium at the end of the sixth century, claims it as the production of Apollinaris himself; and it may thus rank with those pseudonymous productions which have been most disastrous to the peace of the Church, for it became, in fact, the source of Monophysitism. Cyril had quoted it, in all good faith, as by Athanasius, in his treatise to Arcadia and Marina, before the Council of Ephesus; and after that date he explains "one nature" in the sense of "one person," here and in the *Quod unus est Christus*.

Once more, at the end of a valuable and instructive letter to Valerian, bishop of Iconium, Cyril defends the Formulary from the charge of Nestorianism, having fully explained in what Nestorianism consisted. There, too, he uses *physis* as a synonym for *hypostasis*, as in his reply to Theodoret. Lastly, we must look at Cyril's letter to Successus, or Succensus, bishop of Diocæsarea in Isauria. This person had sent to him a memorial, containing some questions about the Faith. "Ought two natures to be predicated of Christ, or only one?" Cyril answered by referring to the heterodox position assumed by Diodore of Tarsus and by Nestorians after him. They separated God and Man in Christ into two separate beings, "united" only by community of honour. The truth upheld by Cyril, of one Christ, was charged by some with being what Apollinaris asserted; but Apollinaris held that the Godhead was in some way changed, and that there was not a true Manhood. To exclude this error, it must be plainly taught that the flesh, though it has become "God's," is flesh, and not Godhead; and the Word, although the flesh has become His, is God and not flesh. Thus Christ is *of* (or *from*) two natures, yet but one Christ. It is not true to say that after His resurrection His body was absorbed into Godhead; it was ineffably glorified, it might be called "divine," but it was not converted into Godhead: that would be impossible, and none of the fathers ever

taught it. He concluded by referring to Athanasius's letter to Epictetus, and to the corruptions which, he supposed, Nestorius had introduced into its text. Succensus sent him another paper, containing objections which had been made to his teaching, by persons who, as Cyril says, "loved a perverse form of so-called knowledge." "If there is but 'one nature incarnate,' then it was in His own divine nature that Christ suffered." "Why so?" asks Cyril in his second letter, which was his reply. "It is not simply 'one nature,' but 'one nature incarnate;' that is, the Godhead *with* the assumed and united flesh, which alone was passible." "But does not the phrase annul the manhood?" "No, it does not imply any fusion: the Word and the flesh remain each in their natural distinctness; the 'nature' is one, but incarnate; one, as man is one, though made up of soul and body." "But if Christ is perfect God and perfect Man, co-essential with the Father as to Deity, with us as to manhood, that implies a human nature or essence in Christ." Cyril answers, "Well, He is perfect man; He suffered in His earthly nature: the idea of His suffering in His Deity—which Nestorians impute to us under the name Theopathy—is not ours; we disown it." "But if He suffered in flesh only, was His suffering voluntary? Or if it was, then He suffered in the 'nature' of Manhood; and *that* means two natures after the Union." "Holy Scripture," says Cyril, "says that he suffered in flesh, and therefore *that* is a better phrase than 'He suffered in the nature of Manhood;' although that phrase, unless perverted, in no wise injures the doctrine of the mystery. For 'nature of Manhood' is but an equivalent for flesh and soul." He proceeded to warn Succensus, in the very language which he had used to Acacius, against the unfairness of those who confounded the position of the Orientals, as stated in the Formulary, with that of the Nestorians.

What are we to infer from these letters? We see, no doubt, a certain reluctance on Cyril's part to call the manhood a "nature." But it is certain that the word *physis*, commonly rendered "nature," had not even yet acquired a precisely defined import. It had been used occasionally, by Alexandrians, for "person." Athanasius himself, in his discourses against the Arians, had described the Son's "nature" as inseparable from the Father's. And so Cyril had spoken, in his reply to Theodoret, of "the Word's nature *or* hypostasis," although in the very next line he had described it as "united to human nature," and elsewhere had

virtually admitted "two natures" by saying that "the Word suffered the humanity to go through the laws of its own nature." This prepares us for the interpretation put by Cyril on the phrase so mischievously ascribed to Athanasius, "one nature of God the Word, but that nature incarnate." He was not, we see, arbitrarily twisting the term out of its received sense; it had been used to indicate "person," and thus he was justified in claiming it for the idea on which he had all along insisted, and which is quite distinct from "Monophysitism,"—that in the Incarnate Son there were not to be recognised two beings, "linked in amity," but one being, one Ego, existing in two spheres of life, and combining in His single Self what was Divine with what was human, so that, in fact, it was equivalent to his own phrase "one *hypostasis* incarnate." Considered apart from Christ, the words "God" and "man" represented two beings; in Christ, "God and Man" represented one being, although a being who was at once truly and perfectly God, and truly and perfectly Man. The phrase, as used by Cyril, was far enough from meaning that at any moment whatever after the Incarnation Christ had ceased, or could cease, to be Man; the manhood, once assumed, was really His, and would be His through all eternity.

Such, in the main, was Cyril's second series, if we may so speak, of explanations of his language. He had attacked Nestorianism by statements which seemed, to many at least, to tend to, if they did not actually reach, Apollinarianism. He had explained himself to the effect that he had not in the least meant to deny our Lord's real Manhood. He next accepted, from the more moderate of these critics, a formula which very distinctly affirmed that truth, but which to some extent went beyond his former admissions: forthwith he found himself obliged to remove the anxieties of friends who thought he had granted too much in that direction. Tillemont well remarks that the criticisms made on Cyril's articles were overruled for a signal good: "the Orientals rendered a great service to the Church by deferring their condemnation of Nestorius until Cyril had by anticipation stifled the Eutychian heresy, by explaining himself more clearly than he had ever done before." But another remark is equally true—that Cyril's hasty choice of terms in some of his anathemas produced not only immediate complications but lasting mischief; and that greater consideration and forethought on his part might have prevented Nestorianism from becoming afterwards so strangely

powerful. Had not the terror of Apollinarianism led many to shrink from the name and the teaching of the Council of Ephesus, Christendom would not have seen a Nestorian Communion animated by a vast missionary energy, pushing its way into the far East, attesting its success by the famous Singanfu inscription in the eighth century, extending in the eleventh "from China to the Tigris" under a patriarch and twenty-five metropolitans, and canonizing "Saint Nestorius," in one of its Eucharistic services, at this very day. Again, as to the phrase "one nature incarnate," Cyril might be excused for using a phrase popularly deemed Athanasian; but it was verbally *prima facie* inconsistent with the Formulary of Reunion, although by explanations the two could be substantially harmonized; and we shall see that its retention, by producing a certain hesitancy in the application of "nature" to Christ's Manhood, gave great occasion to the unhappy heresiarch of the next great controversy, and therefore contributed towards the formation of that Monophysite community which has so long confronted the Eastern Church.

CHAPTER XLI.

THE END OF THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY.

IN speaking of the sections of Eastern Churchmen who at this time resisted the Reunion, and then after a time were practically coerced into accepting or expelled for refusing it, we have summarised what in fact belongs to two or three years, and must now look to the state of the Church of Constantinople just a year after the reconciliation of Cyril and John. Maximian died on Maundy Thursday of 434, the 12th of April; and Theodosius, dreading the disturbances inevitable from a contested election, stretched his authority so far as to "permit" the prelates then at Constantinople to enthrone Proclus, for whom a majority had voted, as we have seen, in 431, but who had then been set aside by a technical objection—such as had been urged against Gregory Nazianzen—to his "translation" from the see of Cyzicus, which he had never *de facto* occupied. This time Theodosius was determined that no such objection should stand in the way of an appointment manifestly the best possible; and he was fortified by letters in which Celestine had expressed to Cyril, to John, and to Rufus of Thessalonica, his opinion in favour of the lawfulness of episcopal translations. So prompt was the Emperor, that Proclus was enthroned while Maximian's body still remained unburied; and he officiated, as bishop, at the funeral of his predecessor. The bishops who enthroned him, in their synodical letter announcing his accession, excused the rapidity of their proceedings by saying that "multitudes in various parts of the city" had loudly demanded the restoration of Nestorius. It appears, too, that in this letter threats were held out, or warnings given, as to the imperial displeasure which would be provoked by those who might refuse to be in communion with Proclus. But his accession was an omen of happiness for Eastern Christendom, for he was very averse to harsh measures,

and, as Socrates expresses it, "was minded not to harass any sect, and proposed to win over heretics by gentleness rather than by violence." Many of his people would remember his brilliant and oratorical sermon at the opening of the controversy in defence of the phrase Theotocos; but some of the Nestorian party seem to have thought that he did not go so far as Cyril, or even that he would condemn the Cyrilline articles. In this they were greatly mistaken: and he soon disabused them by calling John, in the usual form, "pious," and by requesting his and Cyril's communion.

When the new bishop had occupied the throne of St. Chrysostom for about a year and three months, a further step was taken by Theodosius against the author of the whole complex and far-reaching trouble. Nestorius had been living, undisturbed, in his monastery near Antioch: and one of his adherents went so far as to claim that, if John wished to do his duty and deserve the recognition of faithful men, he should lead the true bishop of Constantinople into the great church of Antioch and place him on the throne by his side. But now, on August 3rd, 435, the four years' tranquillity which Nestorius had been enjoying was terminated by an order from the Emperor, that his writings should be burnt, and his followers branded with the name of "Simonians," and forbidden to meet for worship on pain of losing all their property: and in consequence, probably, of requests from John of Antioch, Nestorius himself was ordered to be removed to Petra, and his property made over to the church where he had formerly presided and, as the Emperor expressed it, "betrayed the sacred mysteries." If he ever went to Petra, it was but for a brief space; for he was carried to a yet more dreary place of exile, the Greater Oasis, whither Catholics had formerly been sent under the Arian tyranny. Different accounts were given of its climate; but perhaps some light may be thrown on this point by a later imperial law forbidding any one to be banished to the Oasis for a longer time than one year. The unhappy Nestorius lived there for about four years, for he was there when Socrates wrote his "History" in 439.

It is remarkable that the same Irenæus who had been sent by Theodosius to the Council of Ephesus was banished to Petra as a partisan of Nestorius: he there wrote, about the year 440, a "Tragedy," or tragical narrative of his hero's sufferings, in which he vehemently upheld the cause of Nestorius; quoted his statement to the effect that "the Egyptian" had garbled his sermons in order to produce a false impression on Celestine and others;

expressed sympathy with the thorough-going Nestorianizers of the synod of Anazarbus; described Alexander as "the great combatant for truth," and John of Antioch, after his concessions, as "the man of Antioch;" and accused Cyril of intending to cancel the very terms of the "Reunion" by a new movement against the already humiliated Orientals. To the "Tragedy" of Irenæus the preservation of much material that would otherwise have perished is due, since, though it is no longer extant itself, it was largely used by the Latin writer who soon after the time of Justinian put together a "Synodicon," or collection of the documents and letters belonging to the Nestorian controversy.

But the government was not even yet contented. At Cyril's urgency, Aristolaus was again in 435 sent into the East, with orders that the bishops who had accepted the Reunion should expressly anathematize Nestorius. These orders were widely obeyed. We learn from a letter of John to Proclus that in Mesopotamia, Osrhoene, Euphratesia, the "two Syrias," Isauria, Arabia, Cilicia, there was general acquiescence; in other words, his own patriarchate had accepted this test of anti-Nestorian orthodoxy. Cilicia, the country of Theodore, still retained some elements of Nestorian resistance; but we have a letter of Helladius of Tarsus and four other bishops of Cilicia Prima to the Emperor, professing, evidently in mere obedience to his orders conveyed through Aristolaus and without any change of convictions, that they held Nestorius to be deposed, and anathematized whatever impious doctrines he had preached, had otherwise uttered, or had put into writing; and that they further anathematized Nestorius himself and all who were now authoritatively called Nestorians, "following, in this act, the holy bishops Sixtus, Proclus, Cyril, and John." Helladius's personal feeling as to this enforced submission may be gathered from a previous letter of his to Nestorius, in which he assured him of unshaken affection, and prayed to be associated with him at the day of judgment. This is a good illustration of the impolicy, or rather the folly, of the plan of enforcing anathematisms by terror of imperial displeasure, for which Cyril was mainly responsible, and in which he placed such a persistent and lamentable confidence. In fact, the success of the Reunion had apparently brought back all his vehement combativeness, all his passion for denunciation and anathema. This result was promoted by the persistent representations of Maximus, a deacon and abbot of Antioch, to the effect

that some bishops, having anathematized Nestorianism, were maintaining it in altered language; and Mosæus, or Moses, bishop of Antarat, who had been a correspondent of Cyril's, was specially named as a Nestorianizer. He received some further information from Beronicianus, metropolitan of Tyre, to the effect that the Oriental bishops were willing to renounce Nestorianism in the terms prescribed by Theodosius, but that they insisted that nothing more should be expected from them. This at once fired Cyril's zealous wrath against the appearance or suspicion of Nestorianizing sympathies. He had himself moved the Emperor to exact the anathema: was it, or was it not, to be a *bona fide* and thorough-going rejection of all and everything that Nestorius had erroneously asserted? He was informed that some prelates were saying, "Nestorius was condemned for rejecting the Theotocos, and for nothing else"—a gross evasion; and, provoked by this discovery, he exhorted Aristolaus to make the text more precise and ample. "Prepare the bishops," he urged in 436, "to anathematize Nestorius" in fuller terms, asserting the Personal Union and the Theotocos, but (it must in fairness be added) plainly acknowledging that the God-Man suffered in Manhood, and that there was nothing like "conversion" or "confusion." "Let this," he wrote, "be added to the anathematism against Nestorius; it is all implied in the Emperor's orders." But John of Antioch, it appears, objected to this demand; and wrote to Proclus the letter above alluded to, in which, after informing him of the good dispositions prevalent throughout his own patriarchate on the question of Nestorianism, he requested that nothing further might be exacted, and that the Church might at last have freedom to devote herself to the task of maintaining Christianity against the Jews of Syria and the heathens of Palestine and Phœnicia—a remarkable testimony to the tenacity of life still retained by even Eastern paganism, and to the ceaseless activity of Judaism against the faith. John's letter is also interesting as reciting the names of fathers, Eastern and Western, such as Ambrose and Cyprian, Athanasius and John (Chrysostom), whom he followed in his understanding of Christian doctrine: he also transcribes the Nicene Creed in its true form, as it had been acknowledged by the Council of Ephesus. Cyril found that he had gone too far, and wrote again to Aristolaus, asking this time that a special rejection of the several points of Nestorianism might be required from those who were "suspected" on this matter. Further indications of his anxiety as to crypto-

Nestorians are found in a letter to Maximus and others, in which he says that he has drawn up a tract in which the three main points of the Catholic doctrine as attacked by Nestorius are briefly treated of; and also in a letter to John, complaining that, according to the information of a priest named Daniel, Theodoret was still unsound, "had not really wiped off from himself," as Cyril had hoped, the stain of Nestorian error; which, indeed, he added, was but too likely if Theodoret had not yet condemned Nestorius. What came of this we do not know, except that Theodoret certainly did not condemn Nestorius until the October of 451.

One more event belongs to this last period of the controversy. We are warranted in thinking that Theodore of Mopsuestia had been the true parent of Nestorianism. Of this fact there was a significant proof after the proscription of Nestorius's own writings. The Nestorians circulated a vast number of copies of Theodore's treatises, and of translations of them into Syriac, Armenian, and Persian. The like was done as to the writings of his master Diodore of Tarsus. Rabbula of Edessa had come across a number of Theodore's writings, in his own diocese, as early as the spring of 432, had commanded them to be burnt, and had boldly anathematized the great "Commentator" or "Expositor" in his cathedral. He was now near the end of his long course, a blind old man, but with fire and energy unabated. As he had formerly told Cyril that "a certain Cilician bishop," although careful not to shock his people, had been the real founder of the new heresy, so he now, in connexion with Acacius of Melitene, wrote in 435, or perhaps in the next year, to warn the Armenian prelates against the dissemination of Theodore's theology. The Cilician bishops wrote to the Armenians on the other side; and the result was that the Armenian bishops sent two priests, Leontius and Aberius, to request Proclus to give his opinion: was Theodore right, or Acacius and Rabbula? They themselves evidently expected and wished him to decide against Theodore. They supplied him with an account of the complaints against Theodore, and with "a single volume" of Theodore's works; and after due examination he wrote a dogmatic letter or "Tome," in which, after descanting on faith, hope, and charity, he set forth the duty of strictly adhering to the right faith, and proceeded to state the doctrine of the Incarnation. "God the Word," he said, "did not enter into a full-formed man, but became flesh—not that He was converted into flesh, for the

Godhead remains superior to all change; the word 'became' shows the indivisibleness of this perfect union, the singleness of the person, while the word 'took' (the form of a servant) shows the immutability of the (Divine) nature. God the Word, then, *is* Christ; the nature of God knows not of two Sons; the Only Father begat an Only-begotten; if Christ is another than God the Word, Christ is necessarily a mere man." Then, as if anticipating the remark of a great modern preacher, "If it is easy to wrong God by denying His greatness, it is easier to wrong Him by denying His condescensions," Proclus goes on to warn his readers against those who are scandalized by the swaddling clothes, the lying in the manger, the gradual bodily growth, the sleeping in the boat, the weariness, the hungering: if they scoff at the sufferings, they deny the nature, therefore they do not believe in the Economy" (*i.e.* the Incarnation), "and therefore they forfeit their salvation." "Of two things one: either they must be ashamed of the sufferings, and deny the nature," which is Manicheism; or, "if they accept the benefit of the Incarnation, and confess the nature, they must not be ashamed of the sufferings which happen to it. Since I know and am taught by religion to believe in one Son, I confess the *hypostasis* of the Incarnate God the Word to be one." He proceeds, after this important statement, to insist on the personal unity, and, as entirely consistent with it, on the reality of Christ's humanity: he adduces the great text, Rom. ix. 5, in proof of this twofold truth; and concludes by applying to the existing circumstances of the Armenians the Apostle's warning against being "spoiled" by a deceitful philosophy. This memorable and admirable document exhibited some advance from the strict Alexandrian language towards the terminology afterwards established at Chalcedon; for "nature" was freely used by Proclus of Christ's manhood. And, more important still, the ambiguous and perplexing phrase, "one nature incarnate," gave place to "one hypostasis incarnate," which brought out the sense in which Cyril had used the former phrase. Thirdly, Proclus affirmed that "one Person of the Trinity was incarnate"—a sentence which afterwards produced a controversy. But throughout the whole Tome he did not *name* Theodore, although he marked some propositions of his as heretical.

The Tome was communicated by Proclus to the two great Churches of Alexandria and Antioch. Basil, a deacon of Constantinople, conveyed one copy of it to Cyril, and went so far as to propose that Cyril should not only condemn the propositions taken

from Theodore's writings, but should add Theodore's name, so as to imply that *he* should be anathematized. We know not how Cyril answered; but Basil returned home, and made a similar proposal to Proclus, who was not much inclined to comply with it. Theodotus, too, the envoy of Proclus to Antioch, took upon himself, probably in conjunction with the abbot Maximus, to make the same demand to bishop John. This proposal to condemn Theodore by name, when it became known, caused a great excitement at Antioch; a loud outcry arose, even in church, "May Theodore's faith be spread! We believe as Theodore did." The bishops assembled with John in synod approved of the teaching of Proclus, but declined to anathematize the dead bishop on the ground of language which might in part bear a good sense or have parallels in the writings of approved fathers; the more so, that Theodore had done great service against Apollinarianism, and his name was so honoured that the people would never suffer it to be condemned. They wrote to Proclus accordingly; and he disavowed the addition of Theodore's name to his document as done without his authority, but persisted in desiring that the passages extracted from Theodore should be condemned, though without any mention of their author. The Orientals also wrote to Cyril, assuring him that the proposal would never answer any good purpose, and would furnish a precedent full of peril. They admitted that Theodore had used some "hard" language, but urged that the passages cited as his might find parallels in the writings of Athanasius, the Gregories, and Basil. This was to minimise the real gravity of Theodore's deviations from orthodoxy, and to do injustice to the great names which were thus adduced to shield his reputation. If the writers knew what they were saying, they must have been afraid to offend popular opinion as to "the Expositor."

Cyril was thus made aware of the dangers which would attend an attempt to anathematize the name of one whom the Eastern Churches so highly honoured: but he had a very clear and well-founded opinion as to the relation of Theodore to Nestorianism, and he accordingly wrote to the Orientals, desiring that no comparison might be made between Theodore, who "had borne down full sail against the glory of Christ," and the holy fathers, such as Athanasius, and that no such teaching as Theodore's—in short, no Nestorianism—might be tolerated among the clergy; while at the same time he disclaimed all desire to rekindle strife among Churchmen, and even exhorted his brethren to receive without

unfriendly suspiciousness any sincere convert from Nestorianism. On the whole, he wished to have Theodore's opinions excluded from the Church—he had heard, during a visit to Jerusalem, of the care taken to circulate Theodore's books as part of the Nestorian propaganda—but found it safer not to attack his name and memory according to the proposal unfairly fathered on Proclus and passionately urged by such zealots as the deacon Basil, some monks of Armenia, and the Antiochene abbot Maximus. The latter, who had even, at one time, renounced John's communion on the ground of his indulgence towards Nestorius, visited Cyril at Alexandria, and showed him a letter of Acacius of Melitene to John, full of zeal for orthodoxy. He also told Cyril (which was no news) that the Nestorianizers were claiming the Nicene Creed as on their side; and Cyril therefore wrote his tract on "The Holy Symbol," vindicating the true sense, and sent copies of it to Theodosius and Pulcheria. In this paper he commented on John i. 14, excluding not only any change of the Word into flesh, or any fusion or commixture, but "what some talk of as a *consubstantiation*," which is virtually the Monophysite theory properly so called, and is set aside by Cyril as incompatible with the immutability of the divine nature. He afterwards wrote to Proclus, referring to the excitement caused by the proposal to anathematize Theodore, and advising that, as that bishop was "gone away to God," nothing should be done in the way of condemning him by name: it would be sufficient that well-instructed Christians would reject what he had erroneously written. And thus the question of anathematizing Theodore, or rather his name and memory, slept until, for purposes largely political, it was unhappily revived a century later by Justinian; and an order from Theodosius, evidently inspired, or at least approved, by Proclus, forbade further discussion as hurtful to Christian peace and ecclesiastical tranquillity.

Here, then, we may close our survey of the Nestorian controversy in connexion with the Third General Council. The faults and mistakes committed on the "orthodox" side must not be forgotten or unfairly varnished over: "orthodoxy" gains nothing, and loses much, by indiscriminate and uncandid hero-worship. Yet, when we have admitted everything of this sort, we have not only to take note also of unfairness and bitterness on the side opposed to Cyril, but the fact remains plainly written on the face of the history: If Nestorianism had gone unrebuked, the Church would have compromised its fidelity to the doctrine of the Divine Incarnation,

and of all that such an Incarnation involves for man. Whatever elements of earthly passion mingled with the persistent zeal of the great Alexandrian patriarch, this at least is his praise, that he saw clearly, and grasped tenaciously, the issue raised by the sermons of Nestorius. It was not whether the Mother of Christ should, or should not, be honoured by a particular title; but whether Christ Himself should, or should not, be believed in, and worshipped, as personally and actually Divine. Cyril and the Council of Ephesus were the instruments of securing that belief and worship as the perpetual inheritance of Christendom. And if we wish to put the issue into plain words for the benefit of any who may have been accustomed to think it "verbal," we may well ask them to read again the second paragraph of the Gloria in Excelsis, or those three short verses of the Te Deum which begin with "Thou art the King of glory, O Christ;" and then consider how they would have to be re-worded in order to represent the Nestorian Christology. Nor can we safely ignore the practical interest which certain tendencies of modern religious thought attach to this old controversy about the Theotocos and the Hypostatic Union. We often meet with what seems the frankest and readiest recognition of Christ's "divinity." In the words of Archbishop Alexander, men "ring the changes on the word 'divine.'" But in what sense do they use it? If we inquire, we find that Christ is for one man "divine," inasmuch as He was the best of all men, and, as such, morally the nearest to God; for another, because, as being the best of men, He best exhibited what is called "the essential unity of the human nature with the divine." And it is manifest that each of these applications of the term "divine" to Jesus Christ is, in its own way, such a misuse as gravely to impair the idea of "divinity."

CHAPTER XLII.

WESTERN AND EASTERN AFFAIRS TO A.D. 445.

THE great theological controversy of the East had its echoes also in the West. Augustine, as we have seen, had had occasion to affirm what Cyril called the Personal Union as against the errors of Leporius; and now we find two Spanish Churchmen, Vitalis and Constantius, writing to their "venerable pope" Capreolus of Carthage, as to the new opinions recently ventilated in their country. "There are some here who say that we ought not to say, 'God was born.' They believe that a mere man was born of the Virgin Mary, and that afterwards God dwelt in him; we, your humble servants, resist their assertion, and believe that God was in Mary's womb, took to Himself a certain element, made for Himself 'man' (*hominem*), and was born, true God, and true Man whom He assumed." This rather confused statement was cleared somewhat further on, where the writers said that a mediator must be both God and Man: they proceeded to say that the new theory represented the Crucified as a mere man, from whom the indwelling God had departed. Capreolus replied in a long letter, identifying this new opinion with "the Nestorian heresy," and referring to "the glorious Council" which had assembled in the East to quench that error with the light of apostolic truth. One ought not, he said, to wonder that, even though then condemned, it had again asserted itself. Capreolus then gave an elaborate statement of the Catholic doctrine. God and Man in Christ formed one Person: God did *not* dwell in Christ as He dwelt in patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and other holy and illustrious men, but in a manner unique, so that He took to Himself "homo" and was born man. He who was eternally begotten in heaven was the same who was made man in the Virgin's womb. Therefore there can be no

separation of the Person of God and of Man in Christ: the union is inseparable. The Impassible One suffered through the passible whom He assumed. Not even in the Passion was God absent from that Man; else we could not identify "the Lord of glory" with the "Crucified." Capreolus acknowledged, with eloquent and emphatic reiteration, that the Divine nature could not be included within limits, nor deprived of its omnipresence, nor impaired by conditions, nor affected by sufferings. But, he insisted, God the Word was present not only on the cross, but in the tomb, in the under-world; while yet the Redeemer, being Man as well as God, was susceptible of "the sufferings and agitations of a true man, and sustained in Himself all the forms of our infirmity." After commenting on several texts, among which were the confession of St. Peter at Cæsarea Philippi and the words, "I ascend to My Father and your Father," Capreolus concluded by exhorting the two "servants of God" to uphold this sacred doctrine "as the truth of Scripture and as the teaching of great, learned, and eloquent men." It is observable that he, like Augustine and other Latin Church writers, employs the ambiguous "*homo*" for human nature or manhood, even though he is distinctly controverting the Nestorian Christology—so deficient was the Latin Church still in technical language.

It is satisfactory to turn at this period to the Southern Gallic Church as exhibiting an earnest zeal for the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, and for the Catholic rule of doctrine altogether, whatever difficulties or controversies or inadequate statements on the question of grace might be rife within its border. The illustrious island-monastery of Lerins was now the abode of a man who has made the name of Vincent still more memorable in the history of theology than it had been in the history of martyrdom. He was a presbyter in the Lerinensian community; in early life, he himself tells us, he had been "involved in the excitements of a secular calling." When he became a monk, he devoted himself to "assiduous study" of Scripture and Church writers; and at last, three years after the "holy Council of Ephesus," that is, in 434, he composed, under the name of "Peregrinus," his "Com-monitory" (or "Reminder") "against the novelties of Heretics." It was, he thought, important to fortify the faithful with new defences against the new artifices of heretics. He would write simply and plainly, for his book was to have a practical aim: he would furnish, or rather he would recall to the minds of

Churchmen, a test whereby to try the spirits of various teachers. Let this test be the traditionary doctrine of the Church as interpreting Scripture; for Scripture, from its depth, is variously interpreted, and hence the necessity of "the rule" of Catholic consciousness as to the true sense of prophets and apostles. Accordingly—thus early does his world-famous formula present itself in the book—"in the Catholic Church it is of the greatest importance that we should hold that which has been held *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*;" which, in other words, possesses the characteristics of "œcumenicity, antiquity, and consent,"—consent, as he explains, entire or nearly entire. "Manifestly," says Professor Stanton, in his excellent volume on "The Place of Authority," this "rule was not intended to apply literally;" each of its elements must be understood, as indeed some legal maxims have to be understood, with allowance for generality of expression; and the author is thinking rather of controversies within the Church than of those which are carried on with outsiders. "But how," Vincent supposes a querist to ask, "if one part of the Church falls from the faith?" We must prefer the sound portions. "How if heresy endeavours to infect the whole Church at once?" We must cling to antiquity, which cannot now be deceived by any false novelties. "What if, in antiquity, some names, or a whole province, appear to have been in error?" Follow the rulings of an universal Council. "What if no such rulings be found to bear upon the subject?" Compare the sayings of the ancients, especially of approved doctors, and go by what they concurred in teaching. Take the case of Donatism: the Catholics of Africa, as united with the general body of the Church, are seen to have been right, and the Donatists wrong. Or look at the times when the Arians seemed masters of Christendom: the appeal to antiquity was enough to vindicate the position of those who kept clear of that "profane novelty." The heroic confessors of orthodoxy overcame by holding fast to the "deposit" of the truth. That is the mark of true Churchmanship; the more religious a Churchman is, the more zealous is he against innovations. This is illustrated by the old controversy about rebaptism, in which "the Apostolic see" bore witness against the new principle brought in by Agrippinus of Carthage; and that new principle, though supported by the great and saintly name of Cyprian, collapsed: the African ruling vanished "like a dream." After enforcing, on the authority of St. Paul's anathema (Gal. i.

8) and other texts, the duty of rejecting all doctrine that could not make good its claim to be part of the original Christian belief, Vincent passes on to notice the plea—sometimes an impressive one—which the adherents of a new theory might derive from the high qualities or commanding position of its chief advocates. It is, he urges, a case like that of which Moses had warned Israel: “The Lord your God is proving you” (Deut. xiii. 3). Nestorius of late had been in high repute; Photinus, “in the memory of our forefathers,” had been admired for learning, eloquence, and ability; no one could surpass Apollinaris in acuteness, scholarship, or industry—his thirty books against Porphyry were proof enough of his zeal in the Christian cause. Then follows an account of the heresies connected with these three names—with a warning not to be deceived by Apollinarian or Nestorian professions of belief in the Holy Trinity or in the “One Person of Christ”—and a statement of the orthodox doctrine, in which “two substances” in Christ, as well as “one Person,” are affirmed with a luminous precision and definitiveness characteristic of Latin theology as framed on the Augustinian model. It might almost seem that the verses on the Incarnation in the “Quicumque” had been condensed from this statement; and the suggestion of Prebendary Ommanney, that Vincent was the compiler of the Quicumque, has not a little to say for itself. For instance, the Commonitory distinguishes the senses in which the Son is “equal” and “inferior” to the Father: it describes Him as “begotten of the Father before times, and born of Mary in time, perfect God and perfect Man,” and as “one not by confusion of Divinity and humanity, but by an entire and peerless unity of person.” But the Commonitory calls Mary “Theotocos,” and therein goes beyond the wording, though not beyond the sense, of the Quicumque. Vincent is “most emphatic in his assertion of our Lord’s perfect humanity,” and also in excluding a misconception which the Latin sense of “persona” might suggest, as if God had “personally” become man only in the sense of having represented or dramatically “imitated” the life of manhood—a “monstrous and wicked mockery” of the Divine fact, exclaims Vincent, in an outbreak of anti-Docetic zeal which may remind one of Tertullian, but which was stimulated by his horror of Manicheism. After some remarks on the privilege and glory of Mary’s Motherhood, and on the Church’s faith as to the Trinity and the Incarnation, Vincent proceeds to illustrate further the

fallibility of any single divine by the examples of Origen and Tertullian; the section on Origen is most beautiful and pathetic, and indicates a wish to think that his writings had been tampered with by "heretics." He presently refers to St. Paul's charge to Timothy as to the preservation of the deposit, "the talent of Catholic faith," which, indeed, admitted of fuller and yet fuller elucidation, but of no substantial addition at all. Not that he excludes all growth or advance in regard to doctrine. Progress, he owns, is both possible and needful in religious knowledge: but it must be by a clearer perception of the original idea, not by the accretion of new ideas; by a clothing of old truth in "smoother" or more definite language, not by substituting a new principle in its place. While using the illustrations of the actual identity of the human frame in the child and in the adult, and the expansion of a germ into its appropriate plant, he limits the development or amplification of doctrine either to the forms in which it is expressed, or to the clearness with which its import is realised. The Church, we are distinctly told, "diminishes nothing and adds nothing; it neither introduces what is superfluous, nor makes use of what is foreign," *i.e.* alien to the original substance of Christian belief. He refers afterwards to the confident appeals of heretics (including Priscillian) to Scripture, which made some rule of Scriptural interpretation necessary for Churchmen, and then he re-states the triple standard already mentioned. There was a second part of the Commonitory, which, according to Gennadius, was stolen from the author while still in sheets; he was therefore obliged to append to the first tract a summary of its contents, concluding with a list of the authorities produced at Ephesus against Nestorian error, and testifying to the principle that antiquity was a test of doctrinal truth.

And yet, it has been usually thought, Vincent himself was not entirely orthodox—was, in fact, Semi-Pelagian, owing to his dislike of the strong predestinarian school. A writer of the name of Vincent, at any rate, was the author of objections to the high Augustinian theology; and the identification of this Vincent, to whom Prosper replied, with the author of the Commonitory, has become the common opinion of scholars. "But in the Commonitory," as Tillemont says, "he has effectually concealed, if he ever entertained, the idea of attacking the doctrine of grace; he has contented himself with establishing noble and true principles, and with leaving to others the task of drawing from them

conclusions of a Pelagian character." It is, indeed, significant that in citing Celestine's warning against persons who introduced "profane novelties," he does not quote the Pope's panegyric on Augustine. But we must recollect that Semi-Pelagianism was not as yet condemned; and there can be no doubt that the ecclesiastical leaders of the Church of Marseilles, who are regarded as its authors, were persuaded that by making the unassisted freewill of man originate a holy life, while they admitted that the assistance of grace was necessary for its continuance, they were, in fact, taking up the only position which could exclude Pelagianism on the one hand and the necessarianism of "irresistible grace" on the other. If grace had not been called irresistible, Semi-Pelagianism might never have been heard of. The Vincent whom Prosper undertook to answer, whether he were Vincent of Lerins or not, was earnest against the predestinarianism of Augustine and of his school as injurious to the Divine character and to the interests of Christian morality: he inferred from it the same sort of consequences that Wesley inferred from Whitefield's Calvinism. Christ, he wrote, according to that hypothesis, did *not* die for all men; God does *not* "wish all men to be saved;" He has created the majority of mankind with the very purpose of condemning them; He has fore-ordained an evil will and its evil results; the falling away of many faithful may seem to be due to their own fault, but is really due to God's fore-ordaining; even if any such persons were to ask for perseverance, they would not obtain it; and those who are thus doomed to perdition, after they have fallen from grace, are incapacitated by God from even wishing to be restored. Now these criticisms, and such as these, may be open to the charge of straining the predestinarian principle to an extreme point, by way of a "reductio ad horribile;" but they contain nothing whatever of that special theory as to grace which is the characteristic of Semi-Pelagianism. They are akin to certain "articles" of Gallic divines, "*capitula Gallorum*," which Prosper, the indefatigable shield-bearer of Augustine, had had to deal with, and from which it appears, as might have been expected, that in the ecclesiastical schools of Southern Gaul Predestinarianism was regarded as Fatalism in a Christian dress. Nine passages of St. Augustine's predestinarian works were also enumerated by two Genoese priests, Camillus and Theodore, as causing them difficulties: and Prosper says that certain propositions professedly extracted from Augustine

were circulated by his critics—a point of which Pascal takes advantage in reference to the “Five Propositions” ascribed to Jansen and condemned as his in 1653 and 1656.

Already before the death of Celestine Prosper, with Augustine’s other zealous admirer, the layman Hilary, had gone to Rome to complain about the language held in Gaul respecting the great African bishop: and Celestine wrote a letter to the Gallic bishops, naming Venerius of Marseilles and five others, and admonished them not to be silent when priests spoke rashly and contentiously, lest connivance on their part should be imputed to them as sin. It was not seemly that bishops, the chief teachers, should allow their subordinates to “claim the first place in teaching.” As to the matter in dispute, “Augustine, a man of holy memory on account of his life and his merits, has always been in our communion, nor has a breath of sinister suspicion ever lighted upon him. We remember that his knowledge was so great, that even my predecessors held him to be among the best of teachers. He was,” the Pope proceeds, “loved and honoured by all. Therefore it is your part to resist these persons, whose numbers we see are unfortunately increasing. Let us be certified that this language is as displeasing to you as to us, by your imposing silence on them for the future.”

A year or two later, in 433 or 434, Prosper himself took up the cause with his treatise “*Contra Collatorem*,” that is, against John Cassian of Marseilles, the author of the “*Collationes*” or Conferences—an account, as we have seen, of conversations on spiritual questions with the anchorites of Scetis. Prosper did not name Cassian; but he made no secret of his intention or meaning as to the person whom he attacked, for he quoted passages from the *Collations*. Cassian, as he represents him, had criticized St. Augustine, and in the thirteenth Conference had plainly adopted certain statements of the abbot Chæremon on the subject of grace and freewill. Prosper owns that one statement is “most Catholic,” namely, that God is the origin of all good thoughts, that He inspires us with the beginnings of a holy will, that goodness cannot even be habitually desired without Divine inspiration. Taken by itself, this teaching would formally contradict Semi-Pelagianism; but Cassian had also intimated an opinion that *sometimes* men “came to grace without grace,” as Prosper states his meaning—that *sometimes* the mere “blessing of nature,” the natural element of goodness, was found to originate those good desires which needed

Divine help for their own consummation; in short, that no universal proposition could be laid down as to this point. In another passage Cassian had represented God as "meeting a man in whom He saw a will bending towards good," and elsewhere had ascribed such inclinations to the "seeds of virtue, deposited by God, as Creator, in the soul"—a proposition which awakened the wrath of the Augustinian Prosper, and led him to pronounce the seeming virtues of the unregenerate to be absolutely unreal. The Pelagian assertion, that grace was given in view of antecedent merits, was disclaimed and rejected by Cassian; but he considered that there were cases in which God was not the originating but the assisting cause of sanctification and salvation—whereas Catholic doctrine, as now established, taught that the Divine appeal, and the movement of grace in and upon the soul, setting aside the irresistibleness ascribed by Augustinianism to that grace, must in *every* case be regarded as the fountain of conversion or of obedience: in other words, that grace must excite as well as assist, must be prevenient as well as subsequent; that the "willing" as well as the "doing" must be, in a true sense, referred to Divine "operation." Cassian's opponent was hardly wrong in representing the difference between Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism as being one mainly of degree, and in admonishing him to abandon an untenable position. The Semi-Pelagian question was not settled until the second Council of Orange under Cæsarius of Arles, in the year 529, immortalised its name by accepting and promulgating those admirably balanced and luminous statements on grace and freewill already referred to, which may be said to have gained a final authority in Western Christendom.

Prosper himself pushes the doctrine of the Fall to extreme results, sometimes quotes only part of a context, makes unfair inferences, and twists the natural import of such passages as Rom. ii. 14 or Luke xii. 57; just as in his "Replies to the Articles of Calumniating Gauls," and in the probably later "Replies to the Articles of Vincentian Objections," he exhibits a capacity for evading points at issue and for making admissions rather verbal than real, which does him small credit as a controversialist. It is observable that he does not apply the term "predestination" in any other than a good sense; in regard to the non-elect he uses the word "prescience," and even makes non-predestination depend on the divine "foresight of a man's departure from doctrine." But he clings to the proposition that grace cannot be resisted; and he

gives no answer to the fundamental difficulty that on the Augustinian view the volition, so called, of good Christians is absolutely determined, and therefore devoid of moral significance, while those from whom the possibility of a right choice is withheld may truly be said to be fore-doomed to sin and to its results. For the question, Why is A chosen for grace and salvation, and B passed over and left helpless? he has no other answer than "Do not knock at a closed door." Prosper was a versatile writer; and his "*Carmen de Ingratis*" goes fully into the controversy from his own point of view. Only his devotion to Rome (Leo I. made him his secretary) can explain the daring assertion that the see of Peter was "the first to strike at the creeping pest of Pelagianism;" he then brings in Jerome and Atticus, the churches of Ephesus and Africa, as "decreeing what Rome approves."

Little more of interest in Western Church history can be pointed out until we reach an event which, considering the historic glory of the African Church, and the interests of Catholic Christianity as against Arianism, was one of the great tragedies of the age. This was the taking of Carthage by Gaiseric in 439.

As we have already seen, the Vandals had entered Africa somewhat more than a year before St. Augustine's death. Gaiseric's personal arrival was in the May of 429. Forthwith a fitful oppression of Catholic bishops and priests gave warning of the coming Arian tyranny; and Victor of Vita, who wrote sixty years after the invasion, describes the tortures inflicted by Vandals in quest of church treasures, and in connexion with this the murder of two bishops by the application of hot iron plates about the time of the siege of Hippo. But several years passed by after this first onslaught; and in spite of the progress of the Vandal arms, there were difficulties in the invader's path, which secured for the Catholics a period of reprieve. To these years of anxiety and terror may be assigned the sermon "On the Times of the Barbarians" in the sixth volume of St. Augustine's works: it is certainly not his own, but it enforces with an earnestness akin to his the duty of repentance under a great national calamity, and warns the hearers against "the plague of Arianism," and against the temptation to profess the Arian creed for the sake of worldly advantage and to accept an Arian re-baptism. In 435 Gaiseric made a sort of compromise with the Romans, the terms of which are variously stated, but which left them in possession of Mauritania, Carthage, and part of the "old Province." This "relaxed,"

as Gibbon says, "the vigilance of his enemies." In 437 he stretched forth his hands to vex the Church by depriving several bishops of their sees and banishing them from their cities: among these confessors was Possidius of Calama in Numidia, who had stood by the death-bed of St. Augustine, and in his life of the Saint of Hippo has recorded the earlier horrors of the Vandal invasion. Gaiseric's intolerance of Catholicism extended even to his own household; for when four Spaniards, Arcadius and three others, whose faithful and intelligent services he had highly appreciated, refused to adopt Arianism at his bidding, he tried to break their constancy by exile and torture, and, when these failed, put them to death; while a lad named Paulillus, the brother of two of the martyrs, who had been a favourite with Gaiseric, withstood threats and repeated beatings, and was at last sentenced, not to death—perhaps through a touch of compunction—but to "the lowest form of servitude." The story that Gaiseric had been at first a Catholic, and that his hatred of Catholicism was the rancour of a seceder to Arianism, is not needed to account for his cruelty, and may be set aside as a Catholic imagination.

It was two years after these events, when the Western empire might still seem secure against any breach of treaty on the part of Gaiseric, and when its chief general Aetius was occupied with Gallic affairs, that the Vandal conqueror, whose characteristic vice was "deliberate and malicious treachery," struck the blow which he had long meditated, and surprised the "head of Africa," the city which, as Ausonius expressed it, would hardly yield precedence to Constantinople, "the Rome of the African world." Carthage was taken on the 19th of October, 439. One can imagine the grief and humiliation with which the Roman officials, and all the citizens who prized the city's dignity as a great seat of Roman government, a great centre of Roman civilisation—who were proud of "the proconsular dignity," of the "senate-house" on the citadel-hill, of "the schools of liberal education," the "workshops," as Salvian calls them, "of philosophers," in which Augustine had been a student and a professor—would witness the triumphal entry of a barbarian who had already inflicted such misery on the province, such abasement on the imperial name. But a far deeper and more heart-searching distress would be the portion of the Carthaginian Catholics, to whom Carthage was the city of St. Cyprian, the meeting-place of twenty councils, the home of a Church which held an unquestioned primacy throughout the six provinces of

the African "diocese," and whose authority in matters of religious observance was regarded as a law to all its sisters, so that they would "neither alter what it held, nor retain what it had corrected." Mournful recollections of Aurelius and of Capreolus would rise to many a Churchman's mind, and most of all to that of Quodvultdeus, who now occupied their seat, and who had reason enough to meditate on the significance of his own name. Churches of stately form and venerable dignity would now pass into the hands of Arian priests: the Nicene faith would be banished from the great cathedral—called "restituta" because it had been recovered from the Donatists, where St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas were buried, and where St. Augustine's voice had often been heard—from the basilica of the chief apostle, the basilica "Novarum" (or "Novorum"), the churches that bore the name of Gratian, of Theodosius, of Honorius, of Celerina, the church of the famous Scillitan martyrs, and, sorest thought of all, from the church which contained "the Table of Cyprian," the altar erected on the site of his martyrdom near the seashore, and from the other which marked his grave in the inland suburb of Mappalia or "the Huts."

Catholics would deplore the profanation of these much-loved sanctuaries, the hopeless break-up of so many sacred traditions and associations; but they would probably acknowledge that Carthage, even after these many years of Christian ascendancy, had deserved, and received, the stroke of divine judgment. As for religion, there had doubtless been much popular zeal in the overthrow of idols: the old worship of the goddess Cœlestis, "the Queen of heaven," the Punic Ashtaroth, with its infamous immoralities, had been suppressed in her vast and splendid temple under the episcopate of Aurelius; and Augustine had been able to exclaim, "What a dominion Cœlestis had at Carthage,—and where is it now?" And yet, as Salvian assures us in his book on "the Government of God," the hideous fascination of her rites had still such a hold on professing Christians, that many of them would do homage to her before or after joining in Christian worship. Moreover, there was still, it seems, an irrepressible dislike of any marked expression of Christian devotedness—a dislike which impelled many of the Carthaginian populace, not so much from unbelief as from a passionate fondness for ease and pleasure, to hoot and curse any monk who showed himself in the streets: the cloak, the pale face, the close-cut hair, were provocative of the coarsest insults. Indeed as to morals, what, it might be asked, had the

sacred leaven done for the purification of Carthaginian society? Some seventy years before, the young Augustine had found Carthage a "furnace of sensuality:" and even now, gross passion and hard-heartedness went, as often, hand in hand; the most shameless drunkenness, the most abandoned licentiousness, were intimately associated with such oppression of the poor, of the widow, of the orphan, as sometimes drove the sufferers, in their agony, to pray for the coming of the barbarians. We must allow for some over-colouring in the dismal picture which we owe to Salvian's indignant zeal. He speaks in the tone of a preacher, of an interpreter of divine judgments to the Roman provincials: he has a moral to drive home, and a liking for strong colours and sharp contrasts. "You," he says in effect, "Catholic Christians, and Romans as you consider yourselves, have brought down this heavy judgment on your own heads. Your vices are far worse, more complex, more inexcusable, than the faults which characterize this and that race among your invaders. *They* do not present such a scandalous combination of profligacy, sinful frivolity, tyrannous injustice, fraudulent self-seeking, as disgraces, in city after city, a refined and luxurious 'Roman' population." The balance is doubtless somewhat inclined by a wish to startle the reader into repentance. "These barbarians, whom you dread and loathe, are more righteous than you." While he calls the Vandals the least brave, "unless he is mistaken," of all the barbarians, he mentions their devout recognition of Providence, and honours their cleanliness of living as a standing rebuke to African licentiousness. And on the whole we must accept his picture of the state of Carthage when it opened, perforce, its gates to Gaiseric.

It is easy to imagine the mingled aversion and dread with which the inhabitants of the great city would look at the lame undersized man, with hard relentless aspect, who now had them and all that was theirs at his mercy. He seized upon all the "ancient wealth" of the city; he dealt severely with its richer citizens, most severely of all with its nobles and its clergy, secularising, as we should say, several of its churches, and assigning others to his Arian ecclesiastics. Yet it appears that a few were either spared to the Catholics, or afterwards restored to them; for in 455 bishop Deogratias had two large basilicas at his disposal, which he turned into infirmaries for captives from Rome. At this earlier period Quodvultdeus and a large number of the clergy of Carthage were stripped of their property, and put on board vessels which Victor

describes as "broken," which, however—it was thought, by a miraculous mercy—brought them safe to Naples. How often must the good bishop have sustained his own and his companions' faith by repeating his own name! Other prelates were likewise driven from their homes, and compelled to choose between exile and slavery. Some who ventured to entreat the conqueror's permission to remain "for the consolation of the people of God," only roused his native ferocity. "I have resolved to let none of your name and race stay here, and yet you dare make such a request!" He was only restrained by his attendants' earnest intervention from causing the petitioners to be instantly thrown into the sea. It would seem, however, that the systematic expulsion of all the Catholic prelates of the proconsular territory was not carried out for about ten or twelve years; and very probably this policy was more gradually carried out than might be inferred from the rapid sketch of Victor. Jealous animosity was on the watch for occasions, and found them sometimes, where overt persecution was not yet begun (that is, among the districts which were made tributary, but not given over by way of "allotments" to the Vandals), in casual allusions to Pharaoh or Nebuchadnezzar, which, as Dr. Hodgkin remarks, were probably "rather more frequent than were absolutely needful to explain the lessons for the day." Many senators of Carthage were expelled, after being compelled to surrender all their property; but though lesser forms of persecution were freely employed, there seem to have been but few cases of actual martyrdom under royal mandate.

It is interesting to find that the little city of Cyrrhos, with its scanty population, gave shelter and relief to more than one exile. Theodoret, in several letters, describes the sufferings of the wealthy and illustrious Celestiacus, compelled to wander in exile and beg his bread—a change of fortune which turned his mind to religion, and endowed him with "the riches of faith:" his sufferings deeply impressed the bishop's heart, as representing in a vivid form that general tragedy of Carthage which, as he says, required an Æschylus or Sophocles to describe its horrors and its pathos. A young Carthaginian lady named Mary was sold as a slave by the Vandals, together with a girl who had been her servant and was now her companion in bondage; they arrived at Cyrrhos, where Mary was affectionately cared for by her former attendant, ransomed by the officers of the garrison, placed among the deaconesses, and finally sent back to rejoin her father, who had "escaped from the

ruin of Carthage" and held a magistracy in the West. Theodoret wrote to a Cilician bishop, entreating him to put her in the way of making the voyage with safety and comfort; the letter, which evidently interested Gibbon, exhibits at once the domestic sufferings consequent on the fall of Carthage, and the kindly nature of the great commentator and controversialist. East and West seem brought together in these letters of Theodoret about the African revolution; and one comes to see and learn more of him in the sentences which strive to express his sympathy for its victims, and in his recognition of the mysterious providence which had "brought others to his doors" and bidden him "show kindness" to sufferers "whose hard lot was a lesson to himself," than in the polemics and Church contests which have been unfortunately associated with his name.

The year of the taking of Carthage is the year at which we take leave of the Church historian who, in his seventh book, has given a short account of the Nestorian controversy and of the episcopal appointments to Constantinople, while at the same time his obvious kindness towards the Novatian sect may have led him to dwell disproportionately on its internal affairs during the same period. Socrates brings down his history through "a length of 140 years," as he says, but more properly of 133 years, from the proclamation of Constantine as Emperor in the July of 306. The work had been a labour of love to the sometime "advocate" or "scholasticus," as he is surnamed, who might now be about fifty years old. His life had been spent in Constantinople. As a boy, he had learned "grammar" from two pagan lecturers, who had fled from Alexandria at the time of the destruction of the Serapeum; and he had evidently studied accuracy in historical or chronological statements, although he did not escape some mistakes as to time (*e.g.* the date of the Sardican Council), and some confusion as to persons and occurrences (*e.g.* as to the sufferings of Paul of Constantinople, the lapse of Liberius, and the appeal of Cyril of Jerusalem from the provincial synod which had condemned him); and he could be attracted by a sensational story, as in regard to the execution of Procopius or the "bigamy" of Valentinian I. He thinks for himself, and judges without respect of persons—although not always without some prejudice, as in the case of Chrysostom. He is not at all diffident in expressing his opinion either on the literary faults of authors whom he has read, or on such a question as the extent of Nestorius's personal heresy. He speaks his mind

with a layman's freedom, and at great length, on the delicate subject—as it must have appeared—of the intrinsic indifference of merely ceremonial observances. His honesty and diligence are best indicated by the fact that after the first edition of his "History" had come out, he got access to the historical writings of Athanasius (we may wonder that he did not fall in with them before), and after studying them and several letters of the great Saint's contemporaries, he re-wrote his first and second books, for which he had relied on the Latin History of Rufinus. But he did not even then correct all the errors into which he had fallen, such as his confused account of the Sirmian creeds, his clumsy duplication of Athanasius's journey to Rome, his misreading of Julius's letter to the Easterns, his antedating of Syrianus's attack on Athanasius by sixteen years, and his strange supposition that the Alexandrian Council of 362 forbade the use of "ousia" and "hypostasis." How far he was connected with the Novatians is an old question, which "must be regarded as undetermined;" but, at any rate, it must be admitted that he had a liking for them, was favourably disposed, at least, to their severe principles of discipline, admired the unworldly tone represented by their conspicuous bishops, and took a particular pleasure in recording events which would be interesting to their community.

When Socrates laid down his pen, there was an event fresh in his memory, and fresh on the pages of his seventh book, which was of wider than sectarian or local interest. Proclus, who was, on the whole, in his eyes almost a pattern bishop, "a good man in disposition, if ever there was one, surpassing in gentleness all who truly deserve the name of priests," had succeeded in terminating the schism which had been provoked by the cruel wrongs of that glorious Confessor for righteousness towards whom, undoubtedly, Socrates exhibits a coldness which one could hardly have expected. The remnant of "Joannites" had refused to communicate with any of the successors of St. Chrysostom, although his memory had been solemnly vindicated by the recitation of his name in the diptychs—a concession made, as we have seen, by Atticus out of policy. It was perhaps at his festival (then kept on September 26) in 437, that Proclus delivered a sermon, of which a fragment remains, an ardent panegyric on the Saint "whose life had been full of anxiety, but his death glorious, his grave in Pontus blessed, his reward abundant." Here, it is supposed, the people interrupted the archbishop's discourse, by demanding that the body of "John" might be brought back to his own city; whereupon Proclus obtained an order from

Theodosius, who had been Chrysostom's godson, to that effect. Accordingly, thirty-three years and some months after Chrysostom's final expulsion, and a little more than thirty years after his death, that grave at the wayside sanctuary of the martyr Basiliscus, in the neighbourhood of Comana, was opened by Imperial agents, charged to convey the sacred remains to Constantinople. Justice was, at last, to be fully done to a name and a life which had been insulted and embittered by the malignity of coarse and worldly natures; to a memory which had for years lain under a stigma which, as we know too well, had exercised an unhappy influence even over such a man as Cyril—which had indeed been rehabilitated at Alexandria itself, but which was now to be exalted, in the face of East and West, to the glory of something like a martyr's crown. Chrysostom had been, in a literal sense, hunted to death by "the world;" and the world, at length, was to make what reparation was now possible. And thus it was that, on the evening of Thursday, January 27, 438, the whole population of Constantinople poured forth to meet the vessel which bore the coffin of their persecuted bishop. The mouth of the Bosphorus, opening on the Propontis—so writes Theodoret—blazed with torches, as on the day of Chrysostom's recall after his first expulsion. Boats crowded near the funeral vessel, and thousands of eyes gazed with eager reverence when its freight was brought ashore at the "Harbour of Julian," where the ground sloped downward from the Hippodrome. Proclus, we may be sure, was there to receive it with all the solemn pomp which the Great Church could muster on such an occasion; and the tender-hearted Emperor, laying his face upon the coffin, entreated pardon for his parents' offences against the Saint. A magnificent procession escorted the body through the Constantinian and Theodosian forums to the Church of the Apostles, where it was finally to rest among emperors and bishops, and where, on some later occasion, Theodoret preached a florid sermon on Chrysostom's trials, and affirmed that "his glorious death was just what his glorious life needed for its completion." This tardy but signal acknowledgment of their hero's claims on the reverence of Constantinople conciliated the rigid little sect of Joannites, who had forgotten hitherto that he would not have approved of their tenacious nonconformity; and the Church of Chrysostom's city was at last recognised by them as legitimate and orthodox.

Another procedure of Proclus was the last event narrated by Socrates; Firmus, the primate of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, having

died, a deputation of his people came to Constantinople in the year 439 "to seek a bishop," *i.e.* to consult Proclus as to the fittest man for the see. He took the matter into consideration. It happened that a Saturday service, in which he was to officiate, brought the members of the senate to the cathedral in order to visit him. One of them, Thalassius, had held the government of Eastern Illyricum: it was reported that he was to be transferred to the Oriental civil "diocese;" but Proclus impulsively fixed on him for the great bishopric then vacant, and at once performed the consecration, a choice as sudden as that of Nestorius, German, or Ambrose—a "wonderful affair," as Socrates says, "and wholly without precedent," for Proclus did not await the imperial sanction. It is hard to say whether the venture was justified by results.

And what was now the situation of the unhappy heresiarch whose seat Proclus occupied? When Socrates wrote, he was "still living in the Oasis." But ere long, the town which he perforce inhabited was pillaged by the Blemmyans, a barbarous tribe. Nestorius was captured, but soon released, and, on being set free, wrote to the governor of the Thebaid to defend himself against the imputation of escaping from penal detention and to ask that his case might be laid before the Emperor. The governor, by way of reply, sent soldiers to convey him to Elephantine, on the frontier of Egypt and Ethiopia. Before he arrived there, a verbal order brought him back to Panopolis, whither he had retired after he had got out of the barbarians' keeping. He was brutally treated, hurried along in spite of his age and weakness and of a fall whereby he had hurt his hand and side. It was the same sort of treatment which had been employed in order to get rid of Chrysostom. A third, a fourth change of his exile took place: he naturally wrote to remonstrate with the governor; but his sufferings, recorded by the Catholic historian Evagrius with a complacency which is sickening and horrible, appear to have soon afterwards been closed by death. It was not long since Theodoret had protested that he would never disown his "friend and father" Nestorius; yet he lived not only to anathematize his name in the Fourth Council, but to affirm that in his exile he endured the prelude of the future punishment of "the impious." We may wonder that such a man as Theodoret could have thus brought himself to anticipate the divine award on the case of a man whom he had for years revered and regarded as a victim of civil and

ecclesiastical tyranny ; we cannot wonder that the barbarity of the provincial government, whether sanctioned or not by Theodosius, should have intensified the loyalty of the Nestorians, through long ages, to the memory of their doctor and their martyr.

The sole remaining champion of another great heresy, which had exercised some influence on the mind of Nestorius, or at least had some affinities with Nestorianism, endeavoured, we are told, in 439 to regain his position in Italy. Julian of Eclanum, "that most arrogant assertor of Pelagian error," as Prosper calls him, is accused by Prosper of having sought the communion of the Roman Church under false pretences, as if he were ready to disown the errors condemned by former popes on the question of Grace and Original Sin. "But," says Prosper, "Sixtus, on the exhortation of the deacon Leo, vigilantly resisted his intrigue, and closed the door against his pestilent attempts." Leo had already enlisted Cassian's pen in the service of the true faith against Nestorianism ; and although the conjecture that he himself wrote certain articles or propositions on divine grace, which have been wrongly appended to a letter of Celestine's, may be nothing more than a plausible guess, his later writings show how strongly he was imbued with the doctrine of the reality and necessity of grace—in short, how hostile he was to Pelagianism.

It was in the autumn of 440 that Leo was called upon to undertake the highest function in his native church. Pope Sixtus died on August 18th of that year, after an episcopate which was distinguished by little else than the rebuilding of the Liberian basilica. This church, dedicated by Sixtus, with the recent controversy in mind, to the "Mother of God," still exists as "Santa Maria Maggiore," and, though damaged by modern enrichment, retains the mosaics placed there by him. After his death, says Prosper, "for forty days the Church of Rome was without a prelate, awaiting, in wonderful peace and patience, the arrival of the deacon Leo, who was then in Gaul, occupied in the task of reconciling Aetius and Albinus." Aetius was the great mainstay of the Western empire—one of "the last of the Romans," in Gibbon's phrase, although he is said to have stained his name by a plot for the ruin of his rival Boniface ; Albinus was a general of inferior reputation. It was significant as to Leo's abilities that he should be employed in so delicate a negotiation, so closely connected with the welfare of the empire. He was summoned from Gaul to Rome by a public deputation, for the universal voice of clergy and laity chose him for

the first bishopric in Christendom, to which he was elevated on the 29th of September, 440.

Thus began the greatest episcopate which the Roman Church had as yet seen, and only three later popes, the first and seventh Gregory and the third Innocent, can in that respect match with Leo I. His inaugural sermon, or a portion of it, is extant, as the first of his sermons: in it he exhibits none of that shrinking from a burdensome office which was natural to some other great saints of the ancient Church; on the contrary, he approached as near as is possible for a Christian to the Aristotelian "high-spirited man, who thinks himself worthy of great things, and in truth *is* worthy of them." A disposition such as this is not particularly "sympathetic;" yet, as Canon Gore has said in his memoir of Leo, "even if we cannot love, we must admire him:" nor can we charge him with undue self-reliance when, as if conscious that God has given him aptitudes for the work and energy to carry it through, he expresses his thanks for the confidence and affection of his fellow-Churchmen, and asks their prayers that he may continue to merit both—may be zealous in his duty towards God and towards his people. Some later sermons of his, preached on the anniversaries of his consecration, throw further light on the spirit in which he undertook his charge. He was conscious, he says, of want of merit, but equally assured of divine support, and able to rejoice whenever he thought of his own appointment as a warrant and evidence of heavenly benignity. Christ, he felt sure, would be with him; and he dwelt much on the conviction that St. Peter had "not relinquished the government of the Church," that his power and authority were still living on in his see, that his patronage was ever extended to his successors and their flocks. On this "Petrine" doctrine, which implied that Peter was supreme ruler of the first Christians, including the apostles, Leo laid great stress; in fact, he may be said to have formed and developed a far more distinct and pronounced theory on the "prerogatives of Peter" than had previously expressed itself in the Church at large—even at Rome it had so far only found utterance in forms less emphatic and detailed. For instance, Leo admits that the powers promised in Matt. xvi. 19 to Peter did "pass on to the other apostles," yet he asserts—without an iota of Scriptural warrant—that they did so pass on "through" Peter, and not otherwise. On another occasion he says that although there are "many priests" (meaning bishops) "and pastors, yet Peter in a peculiar sense rules them all;" and

the practical drift of these very bold assertions appears in his habit of regarding himself as the appointed agent of this universal power. To this opinion we shall find him repeatedly giving very distinct utterance. Yet he combined with this strong hierarchical and, as we may call it, papal tone of mind and teaching a very earnest and explicit recognition of the spiritual dignity, the "royal priesthood," of all members of the Church: he reminded his people that, as baptized Christians, they and he alike had an equal share of that royalty and that priesthood; the consecrating unction had been shed with special fulness on the upper portions of the Church's body, but had also descended in no sparing measure to the feet. Leo may not have been the first Roman bishop who delivered regular sermons to his people: Tillemont dismisses, as a paradox, Sozomen's statement that no sermons were preached in Roman churches; but, at any rate, he was the first of his line who could be called a great or constant preacher, as he was all but the first—Dionysius in the third century constituting an exceptional case—who could be called in any true sense a theologian. One thing must always be observed as to Leo's sermons, and Dean Milman has done it ample justice—the intense Christianity of their tone. The Person of Christ, the facts of His life, His redemptive work,—these are the themes on which Leo loved best to dwell; nor can it be out of place, when he first comes before us as a bishop, to bear in mind this feature of his teaching, which illustrates the part afterwards taken by him in the next great controversy—the controversy against Eutychianism in defence of the distinct reality of a human nature in the Incarnate Person of our Lord.

We may perhaps associate generally with the time of Leo's accession an event which has been usually connected with the last year of Celestine's episcopate, the mission of St. Patrick to Ireland. For even if Patrick's achievements have been multiplied by the wildness of Irish fancy, it is surely an excess of scepticism which denies his historical existence. The silence of Prosper is intelligible if he was a non-Roman missionary. Bede's silence in his *History* (the Martyrological notice is unreliable) is more of a difficulty; but it can hardly outweigh what Professor Stokes describes as "the tradition of a whole nation, embodied in documents some as old as the seventh century," one of which, the letter of the learned Cummian to abbot Seghine, which calls Patrick "papa noster," is dated some forty years before Bede's own birth; while the hymn of Sechnal, if accepted, is actually contemporary

evidence, and Adamnan, who died in 703, speaks of "holy Patrick the bishop" in the preface to his *Life of St. Columba*. It used to be said that Celestine sent him to Ireland very shortly after he had sent Palladius, and, in fact, immediately after the close of Palladius's brief ministry among the Christian "Scots" or Irish. But there is no evidence, in the most trustworthy records, of any Roman mission of Patrick; there is considerable probability that several statements, confidently made about his education and the circumstances of his arrival, have been erroneously transferred to him from Palladius; and it seems hopeless to assign exact dates to the events of his life, although it probably began about the close of the fourth century, and the commencement of his missionary episcopate would probably not be much earlier than the middle of the fifth.

Let us look at the account which Patrick gives of himself in his extant "Confession," which is considered to bear marks of genuineness. It was written when he was an old man, with death in view. "I Patrick a sinner," he begins, "the most rustic and the least of all the faithful, and most despised in the eyes of the many, was the son of Calpurnius, a deacon, who was the son of Potitus, sometime a presbyter." He goes on to magnify the divine mercy which had made captivity in early youth the means of his conversion, and to state his Christian belief in something like the form of a creed, unequivocally Trinitarian. He had long thought of writing but had long hesitated about it; there was in his mind a desire to justify himself against British misconstruction of his motives in settling among the Irish. It was by a divine leading, he declares; it was purely for the sake of preaching the Gospel. He was personally nothing; but he had been employed as God's instrument. The story of his life is one of the most touching that can be found in Christian biography. When he was a boy of about sixteen, Patrick—who, according to another authority, had been baptized by the name of Succat—was taken captive at a farm belonging to his father near "Bannavem Taberniæ," which perhaps is represented by Kilpatrick on the Clyde. It need not be the same as his alleged birthplace Nemthur, supposed to be Dunbarton, anciently Alclud, the fortress-capital of Strathclyde; but it could not have been far inland, for it was exposed to the raids of Irish pirates, who carried away from thence into North Ireland a large number of captives, of whom he was one. There is a difficulty, no doubt, connected with the supposition

that he was a native of the Clyde district (unless we suppose that Patrick's clerical father and grandfather had migrated from the south), for then we meet with a traditional and organized Church life to the north of the scene of St. Ninian's labours, and traceable to a time long before their commencement in 397. However, if we accept the narrative in the "Confession," we find that when Patrick arrived in Ireland, a chieftain named Michul bought the young captive and employed him as a cattle-feeder on the hills. There, amid rain and frost, enduring various privations and hardships, the lad became conscious of a divine presence; the Spirit, as he says, kindled a fire within him: his former boyish carelessness about religion gave place to an intense devotional enthusiasm which made him say often as many as a hundred prayers a day, and nearly as many in a night, rising to prayer amid the cold and darkness, on the wild mountains of Antrim, and feeling no harm nor any "sluggishness." Thus passed away six years; and then Patrick, mysteriously warned and guided, as he affirms, escaped from Michul, got on board a vessel manned by pagans, and after divers perils and much endurance for sixty days—which has been represented as a second captivity—reached his home in Britain, and there was entreated by his parents to remain with them—not to go away again after all that he had suffered. But he had a dream: a man appeared to him in the night-visions, whom he knew to be one Victoricus, from Ireland, with countless letters; one of these he gave to Patrick, who read, "The voice of the Irish," and then, while he went on reading, seemed to hear the voice of those "who dwelt by the wood Foclut, which is near the western sea" (*i.e.* in the present county Mayo), as if they exclaimed all at once, "We beg thee, holy youth, come and walk again amongst us." "This," says Patrick, "pierced my very heart; I could read no more: so I awoke." Visionary as might be his temperament, there was in him that genuine insatiable longing for the salvation of souls, for the diffusion of Christian faith, for the extension of the sacred kingdom further and further within the area of heathendom, which had animated Martin in the preceding century, as it was to enkindle Columba in the succeeding one, and which makes all missionary heroes of all ages and countries to be of one soul and heart. Kinsmen withstood his growing desire to return to Ireland and try to win to the Gospel some of the race that had enslaved him. But they withstood an impulse which brooked no opposition. Patrick held to his

purpose. Where and how he was trained for his work, must be left uncertain: his own account of himself would naturally imply that he had never become a scholar—had gone through no technical or systematic course of education, but retained his original “rusticity.” This, therefore, would tend to discredit the later story of his having studied under St. German in Gaul. We must be equally content with ignorance as to the place, time, and circumstances, alike of his ordination and consecration; his own words give no support to the theory or legend of a Roman mission, and perhaps the most probable conjecture is that he was consecrated by some British prelates. He landed first in Leinster, then stopped at the island of Inispatrick, and ultimately went inland from Strangford Lough, and converted a chief named Dichu. He may perhaps have spent a year in preaching to the Dalriad Irish of the North and then proceeded to the central region of Ireland. There is a famous story of Patrick’s having had an interview with the Irish king Laoghaire (Leary) at a festival gathering held at Tara—where the traces of a royal fortress are still discernible—at the Eastertide of his first year, and of the unsuccessful attempts of Irish priests, or “magi”—like those who withstood Columba at Inverness—to outdo him in wonderful works, after their alarm had been excited by the Easter-fire lighted by the missionary on the hill of Slane before the king’s beacon could be kindled on the hill of Tara. The legendary matter put aside, it is quite credible that, either early or late in his career, Patrick preached at the court of Laoghaire, though he did not succeed in converting the monarch; and with this preaching is traditionally associated the composition of the hymn called the “breastplate,” as if it were a guarantee of safety, in which Patrick appears as invoking supernatural protection for himself against manifold foes and perils. The faith of the Holy Trinity, the power of the Incarnation and the Passion, of the Resurrection, Ascension and Return, the might, wisdom, word, hand of God, the obedience of angels, the holiness of saints, are to be his armour bound around him against incantations of heathen prophets, black laws of heathenism, heresy and idolatry, spells of women, smiths, and Druids, and all knowledge that blinds the soul—evidently meaning magic. “Christ,” he proceeds, “protect me to-day from poison, burning, drowning, wounds; Christ be with me, before, behind, within, beneath, above me, at my right and my left, in the fortress, in the chariot seat, in the poop of the vessel.”

Patrick's general work as a missionary bishop was prolonged until the latter part of the fifth century; and here we need only speak of it as taking him into various districts, and to some places which no earlier missionary had visited, and involving various attempts, successful and unsuccessful, to convert chiefs and kings, various perils surmounted, some hardships endured such as spoliation and imprisonment, conversions and baptisms of large multitudes, personal presents "thrown upon the altar" and refused by him, ordination of clerics to help him in his work, and probably of bishops to share some portion of his responsibility; the establishment of religious communities in a close connexion with tribal life, which, though it was perhaps unavoidable, had some calamitous results; the excommunication of some Welsh soldiers who had slain some of his own newly baptized proselytes; the foundation of a church, not then intended to be archiepiscopal or primatial, but only a kind of central point for other mission-stations, at a place originally called (as Dr. Todd thinks) "The Two Graves," in one of the present streets of Armagh, and then on the hill now crowned by its cathedral. Some of the stories told about him are touching, others actually repulsive. It would seem that the Christianity of his converts was by no means clear of the old leaven of pagan superstition: one ugly feature which it long retained was the habit of hurling curses at opponents; and once for all we must put aside the notion that Patrick was in any sense an ecclesiastical organizer. In fact, it was just in that point that Celtic Christianity, alike in Britain and in Ireland, failed. Abroad, the old Irish Church did splendid work by its missionary enthusiasm; at home, instead of imparting order to barbaric life, it was absorbed into its incurable disorder, and, in the words of the Duke of Argyll (in his "*Irish Nationalism*"), "can hardly be said to have had any civilising influence at all," its monastic schools notwithstanding. It is melancholy to associate the thought of St. Patrick's self-devoted labour with the subsequent "full participation" of Irish monks and priests in the savage fights of "the septs against each other." In that respect, no other national Church was ever so tragically conformed to this world.

Pope Leo, very likely, knew little or nothing of the commencement of Patrick's work. He had much to occupy his attention and exercise his administrative energy. The first piece of business that we know of from his letters was the regulation of the reception of Pelagians into Church fellowship. He had, as we

have seen, acted as a vigilant sentinel, while still only archdeacon, against the insidious approaches of Julian; he now heard from a bishop named Septimus that several Pelagian ecclesiastics in the province of Aquileia had been allowed to join the Church without a recantation, and he wrote—perhaps in 442—to the metropolitan of Aquileia on the subject. The see of Aquileia was practically independent of the Roman patriarch; but Leo peremptorily assumed a right to give orders for the summoning of a synod of its province, in presence of which the converts from Pelagianism might give satisfactory evidence of their soundness in the faith. “Let there be nothing obscure or ambiguous in the words employed by them; for we know the wiliness of these men.” He had some reason for this language: the subtlety with which Pelagius and his followers had availed themselves of different senses of the word “grace” was enough to warrant exceptional strictness in the examination of their professions of orthodoxy.

Between Leo and Hilary of Arles a collision arose about the year 444, on the subject of the respective claims of the sees of Arles and Vienne. The church of Vienne appears to have been senior to that of Arles. In a “Notitia” of Gallic provinces and cities, which the compilers of “*Gallia Christiana*” consider to be earlier than the reign of Honorius, the see of Arles is simply one of twelve suffragans to the metropolitan see of Vienne. But we have already seen how, during the fourth century, the city of Arles was rising into greatness, and the pre-eminence of a city meant, sooner or later, pre-eminence for its church. Five and twenty years before Leo pope Zosimus, persuaded by the bishop of Arles that his see was by right metropolitan, had directed him to “recall under his jurisdiction” the province of Vienne, with the two Narbonensian provinces the principal sees of which were respectively Narbonne and Aix: while Honorius, on April 17, 418, ordered that a yearly assembly of South-Gallic provinces should be held at Arles, “the city of Constantine,” as already their civil metropolis. Boniface and Celestine were less favourable to the see of Arles; the see of Narbonne maintained its independence, though the “*Viennensis*” province, the second “*Narbonensis*,” and that of the Maritime Alps, seem to have acquiesced in their subordination to Arles. In 439, Hilary, as bishop of Arles, held a Council at Riez in the second Narbonensis, to repress the evils caused by the irregular and factious appointment of a young man named

Armentarius to the see of Embrun in the Maritime Alps. He also presided at the First Council of Orange in 441. In 444, while he was visiting German at Auxerre, the two prelates received complaints as to the conduct of bishop Chelidonius of Besançon. At the Council which met to consider the case Hilary presided: on what ground, we can hardly say—possibly, says Tillemont, by concession on the part of the metropolitan of Lyons, or because “the fact that the Prætorian prefect resided at Arles caused other bishops unanimously to defer” to its see. Chelidonius was deposed on the charge of having married a widow: he forthwith appealed to Leo, who, like his predecessors in the case of Aparius, caught at the opportunity of extending his authority over another Church, and admitted the appellant to his communion. Hilary heard of it, and at once, in the depth of winter, set out on foot for Rome, not, as he told Leo, in order to carry on a suit or to make accusations, but to pay his respects, to explain the facts, and to request that the canons might not be infringed. Leo chose to interpret this line as “disobedience to St. Peter,” and asserted (apparently without good evidence) that appeals had often gone from Gaul to Rome. A conference was held, Chelidonius being present. Hilary firmly maintained his own position; and this, in Roman eyes, was a form of insolence, to be punished by placing him under guard. He escaped from this detention, and returned to Arles in February, 445. Leo pronounced his decision: the sentence on Chelidonius was to be quashed and he was to be reinstated in his see. Another case was that of a bishop named Projectus: if his see was in the second Narbonensis, or in the Maritime Alps, it was avowedly subject to Arles; but the point is doubtful. Leo, as before, accepted the complainant’s story without due examination, and charged Hilary with having consecrated a successor to Projectus while he was alive, though ill. We do not know Hilary’s version of this case. But we do know that in both cases Leo was outstepping the lines traced by the Sardican canons about appeals to the Roman bishop, since he was acting as judge in his own person. He also wrote a passionate letter to the bishops of the Viennensis, denouncing Hilary’s conduct, actually suggesting that he had wished to cause the death of Projectus, and professing to excommunicate him and to deprive his see of all metropolitanical jurisdiction. Nor was this all. He procured from Valentinian III. a decree, or “constitution,” addressed to Aetius, Master of the Soldiery, and dated June 6, 445. The

Emperor is made to assert that "the primacy of the apostolic see has been established by the merit of St. Peter, by the dignity of the city of Rome, and also by the authority of a sacred synod, so that presumption should not attempt anything unlawful against the authority of this see." It would have been impossible to cite any synod which had made any enactment to that effect. The decree goes on: "For then only will the peace of the Churches be everywhere preserved, if they as a whole (*universitas*) acknowledge their ruler." Then after a vituperative and *ex parte* reference to Hilary, and an assertion that Leo's judgment "would have been valid throughout Gaul even without any imperial confirmation," it is ordered that no bishop, in Gaul or in other (Western) provinces, shall be allowed "contrary to old custom"—observe this assumption—"to attempt anything without the authority of the pope of the eternal city; that whatever the authority of the apostolic see has ordained or shall ordain is to be law for them and for all; and that if any bishop neglects to obey a summons to the judgment-seat of the Roman prelate, the ruler of his province shall compel him to attend." For every word of this document Leo must be held responsible; and a heavy responsibility it is. The whole proceeding is a blot on the character of the most papal of ancient Roman bishops. Hilary wrote in his own defence, and sent envoys to Rome in order to soothe Leo, but he never yielded the main point. Yet when he died in 449, Leo spoke of him as "of holy memory."

Another matter which came before Leo brought him into correspondence with Cyril. It is interesting to see the two great theologian-prelates, who were to represent for subsequent ages the Church's loyal solicitude for the two aspects of the mystery of the Incarnation, and whose names were to be fervently welcomed as maintainers of the truth in the next Œcumenical Council, now exchanging letters on the intricacies of that Easter-question which Councils and bishops had so often laboured to decide. The Romans used a cycle of Easter calculation extending over eighty-four years, which differed from the cycle employed at Alexandria; and they placed the equinox on the 18th of March, while the Alexandrians placed it on the 21st, so that there was this amount of difference between them as to the earliest time of the Easter full moon. The Council of Sardica had made an ineffectual attempt at harmonizing these differences; and the result of them was sometimes seen in a difference of several weeks between the

Easter festivals of Alexandria and of Rome. Leo was desirous of ascertaining on what day Easter would fall in 444, and consulted Cyril on the matter. Cyril answered that it would fall on the 23rd of April; and Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybæum, on being consulted by Leo as to this answer, "after long study and reasoning found it to be correct."

We may now look briefly at these closing years of Cyril's life. He had outlived John of Antioch, who had been succeeded by Domnus, second Antiochene patriarch of that name, in 441. Domnus was John's nephew, but was inferior to his uncle in ability and force of character. Cyril wrote to him in behalf of an aged bishop named Peter, who had been accused, it seems, of maladministration of Church property, and had resigned his see: after this resignation he had visited Cyril, and represented himself as an injured person, who had been forced by fear and by menaces to give up his Church and had not had a fair trial allowed him. He had been permitted to retain the episcopal title;—that, he said, was all: of the rest he had been virtually deprived. Cyril apparently, accepted the old man's statements, pitied his "tears," and somewhat peremptorily exhorted Domnus to take a consistent course, one way or the other. If Peter could be proved guilty of offences, let him be deprived of the title as well as of the authority of a bishop; if, after trial, he were to be found innocent, let him be restored to his bishopric in full. Bishops, wrote Cyril, ought not to "resign" their sees: if they were worthy, let them continue in their office; if not, let them be deposed. The money which Peter had had to refund ought to be restored to him, for bishops were accountable for their trust to God—a principle hardly compatible with any metropolitical authority. Nothing is known of the result of this affair.

In another matter, in which also an old prelate was concerned, Cyril showed himself equally hasty in accepting the story of a petitioner; and his facility produced unfortunate results. Athanasius, bishop of Perrha in Syria, was accused by his clergy of several offences; the only one, however, which is at all specified in the extant documents had something to do with certain silver columns. He could not stand a trial, but sent, three times over, a deed of resignation to his metropolitan, Panolbius, who was his personal friend, and would have been, therefore, no hostile judge. He retired to his estate near Samosata, but returned thence to Perrha, where he even held some ordinations. Next

he proceeded to Constantinople, where, it appears, Cyril then was ; and told a piteous story to Cyril and to Proclus, in presence of a synod of bishops, who, it is said, were moved to tears—but “tears,” in the style of those days, is almost a conventional expression for regret. Some of his clergy, he declared, had expelled him, had even pretended to pass sentence upon him, had ejected from office the Church stewards whom he had appointed, had struck his name out of the Church diptychs. Both the patriarchs were moved ; both wrote to their brother of Antioch. Cyril exhorted Domnus to have the case tried : if Perrha were distant from Antioch, he might delegate the hearing by letter to other bishops. Proclus wrote at greater length, and in a gentler and more courteous tone, taking care to guard against the supposition that Constantinople was claiming to receive appeals from Antioch. Fortified with these letters, Athanasius presented himself to Domnus ; he afterwards declared that Domnus promised at the time to “fulfil the directions of Proclus and Cyril.” He did, indeed, comply with their request for a trial of the case, and summoned a Council accordingly, giving Athanasius due notice ; but Athanasius, although thrice summoned, did not appear. We shall hear of the affair again in 445, when a Council of Antioch examined it thoroughly, and pronounced against Athanasius ; and subsequent events prolonged this cause as far as the fourteenth session of the Council of Chalcedon.

It is impossible not to observe something of hasty or impulsive credulity, and something also of a dictatorial temper as regarded the affairs of another patriarchate, in the conduct of Cyril respecting the cases of Peter and Athanasius. There is reason to fear that he was unconsciously influenced by a dislike of the nephew and representative of John of Antioch ; at any rate, he was by no means considerate in the tone which he assumed towards Domnus. He was far more in his true position when he took cognisance of the enormities of a wicked priest named Martinian, who, having received ordination and having been appointed Church steward by Eusebius, bishop of Pelusium, stripped the church of its property, took bribes from unworthy persons who aspired to ordination, and then, when popular indignation was aroused, threw the blame on the prelate whom he had made the tool of his baseness. He sent money, Isidore tells us, to Alexandria, in order to procure himself a bishopric. Cyril wrote to him, threatening to excommunicate him if he persisted in so scandalous an attempt. Isidore says that

Cyril ought to have excommunicated him at once, and adds that Martinian, in defiance of the archbishop's warning letter, went to Alexandria, and by his presence and his notorious schemings threw a slur upon Cyril's reputation, as if he would consecrate a bishop for money. It was natural that Isidore should urge Cyril to inflict condign punishment on so evident an offender; but we do not know the result, except that there is no mention of any Egyptian bishop named Martinian. We have evidence, it may be added, in one of Cyril's letters, that he took great pains to secure a careful examination of the character of candidates for holy orders on the part of his suffragans in the Thebaid.

There is a famous letter of Cyril's, which must not be passed over in any account of his life, bearing as it does on his belief in regard to the Holy Eucharist. We have seen how confidently he argued from the Eucharistic participation of Christ's Body to the divine oneness of Christ's person: because Christ's Body is received in the Eucharist as life-giving, therefore it must be the Body of One who is personally God; for the body or flesh of a mere man, however intimate might be his association with God, could possess no life-giving power, according to Cyril's interpretation of John vi. 63. And now we find him writing to a bishop named Calosyrius against the "senseless" notion that the consecrated elements, if reserved (in order to sick communion) for more than one day, lost their sacredness and their sanctifying efficacy. "On the contrary," wrote Cyril, "Christ's holy Body is not changed; but the power of consecration and the life-giving grace still abide within it."

The death of Cyril took place on Friday the 9th (or perhaps Tuesday the 27th) of June, 444, when he had completed more than half of the thirty-second year of his episcopate. And now what are we to say of him? We have seen what he was, in his strength and in his weakness; in his high-souled struggle for doctrines which were to him, as they must be to all thoughtful believers in Christ's Divinity, the expressions of essential Christian belief; and in the moments in which his old faults of vehemence and impatience, his old absolutist temper, reappeared in his conduct, and to a very grave extent compromised the great cause of which he was the champion. He started in public life, so to speak, with dangerous tendencies towards errors of this kind, which were fostered by the bad traditions of his uncle's episcopate and by the ample powers of his see. We cannot say that these characteristics were only

manifested in his conduct in the feud with the Jews and with Orestes, or that they did not survive the period when, although personally guiltless of the blood of Hypatia, he must have felt that his previous violence had given virtual instructions which had been bettered by her fanatical murderers. The old spirit showed itself at certain points of the Nestorian struggle, although on some other occasions, as all fair judges of his proceedings will admit, influences of a softening and chastening character had abated the turbid impetus of his zeal, and had taught him to be more patient and moderate, to distinguish between the essential and the accidental, to sacrifice something in order to save the rest, to tolerate differences of phraseology provided that identity of belief were secured. Those who begin by dogmatizing against dogma—by condemning doctrinal zeal as a feverish and irrational chivalry for a phantom—will find it, of course, most difficult to be just to a man like Cyril, who simply gave himself up, for years, to the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union, that is, to the belief in a really Divine Christ. But if his point of view, which was just the same with that of many great religious heroes—in one word, just the same with that of St. Athanasius—be fairly appreciated as supplying the general motive for his course of action against Nestorius, it will not be hard to do justice to his memory; for the relation which, to his mind, subsisted between that controversy and the vital essence of Christian faith will be plain as the sun at noonday. The issue raised was no verbal or superficial one; it touched the life of the religion that had overcome the world. The theory of Nestorius, whatever ambiguities might be thrown over it by language in which that unhappy prelate occasionally appeared to approach the belief in Christ's single personality, was, on the whole, only too intelligible as destructive of the Incarnation, as substituting for that mystery the notion of an exceptionally intimate alliance between God and a pre-eminently saintly man. And it was not a mere theology of the schools. Its promulgator held the great bishopric of the Eastern capital, involving a central position and a strong influence with the imperial court. He had been specially selected by that court for the office which he held; and he was, in personal character, no dreamer or pedant, whose fancies might die away if left to themselves. He could persecute, as he had shown at the very outset of his episcopate, when he won for himself the name of "Firebrand;" he was a ready and plausible speaker; he had many friends and admirers on his side;

he had a considerable popular following. Then there were others, a miscellaneous company, including civil functionaries as well as prelates, who either accepted his teaching in the mass, or thought that strong language against it was uncalled for and offensive. Cyril might have to face the energetic displeasure of an absolute government ; he had not only the prospect, but the active threatenings, of such displeasure and of its consequences ; he had the burden of ill health, of ever-present intense anxiety, of sharply expressed censure even from some of his most highly esteemed friends, of reiterated imputations in the bitterest language against his own orthodoxy on the Apollinarian question, of misconceptions, misquotations, and suspicions, which hardly left him a moment's rest. There was real earnest in his repeated declarations that he was fighting a hard fight but that he had prepared himself for any extremity, that he was sustained by the consciousness of motives thoroughly Christian, by his belief that it was Christ's own cause. And whatever faults may be discerned in his management of the controversy, it is certain—certain not only to panegyrists of a canonized saint, but to those who care for the truth of history—that the thought as well as the heart of Christendom has pronounced judgment in this cause between Cyril and Nestorius, and has accepted as the expression of Christian truth the doctrine upheld by the former against the latter. For that doctrine, when stated in its essence and apart from technicalities, is simply that Jesus Christ is personally Divine.

CHAPTER XLIII.

THE RISE OF EUTYCHIANISM.

THE tidings of Cyril's death must have been received in "the Orient" with some sense of relief on the part of those who had been, in various degrees, annoyed or disturbed by his persevering energy in the suppression of Nestorianism. But can we believe that Theodoret wrote to the bishop of Antioch, to the effect that "the very dead would be frightened by Cyril's arrival among them, and would send him back to the upper world; that therefore it would be expedient to place a very big stone upon his tomb; that his discourses in Hades would be offensive not only to the spirits which had learned to know God, but even to Nimrod, to Pharaoh, to Sennacherib; that Cyril had up to his death been devising an attack on the bishop of Antioch, but that the latter would do well to pray that he might find mercy, and that the divine clemency might transcend his wickedness"? Such was the letter produced as his, and, as his, reprobated, in the fifth session of the Fifth General Council. Can we believe, too, on the same evidence, that he went to Antioch at this time, and preached before the patriarch Domnus a sermon containing the words, "No one now compels any one to blaspheme: where are they who say that it is God who was crucified? It was a man who died, Jesus Christ; but God the Word raised up His own temple. He who is by nature Son of God is God the Word: Christ is the Son of David, but is the Temple of the Son of God. There is no longer any contention; the Orient and Egypt are under one yoke"? One would say that if Theodoret could have written and spoken thus on this occasion, it would be *his* memory rather than Cyril's which would be branded with ineffaceable dishonour. Cardinal Newman has said, "I utterly scout the idea that the atrocious letter on Cyril's death, ascribed to Theodoret, . . . is really his

writing. If a man of fifty, a bishop, and an ascetic, could allow himself to write such a letter, he would be unworthy of recognition or respect of any kind." To treat such language as a rough joke, still more to quote it complacently as expressing the final judgment of Theodoret on his great adversary of former years, is incompatible with any serious regard for his character. Moreover, the inventor's hand seems to betray itself, first in that passage of the letter which speaks of Cyril as intriguing against the bishop to whom it is addressed. The title, in the acts of the Fifth Council, represents it as addressed to *John* of Antioch: of course this must be an error, for John had died two or three years before Cyril. But the passage is unintelligible if Domnus be thought of; for he could not be formidable to Cyril. The writer must have been thinking of John, whereas Theodoret could not have been either writing to him or thinking of him. Again, look at the fragment of the sermon, in the title of which the error as to John is corrected, for the discourse is said to have been preached before Domnus. The fragment is positively Nestorian. Christ is formally denied to be Son of God as well as Son of David; whereas Theodoret had approved of the Reunion, and in his later writings explicitly declares our Lord to be both Son of God and Son of David: *e.g.* in a letter to a layman, "One Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, the Incarnate God the Word;" and in another to a bishop, "The Lord Christ, the true God, and Son of the true God." Lastly, it would not be natural for Theodoret to assume that Cyril's successor was more favourable to the Orientals than Cyril himself had been; but the fragment clearly implies this when it says that "the Orient and Egypt are now under one yoke." Here, as in similar cases, the forger has forgotten what an actual writer at the time would have been sure to know. He was probably an Eutychian, bent on striking a blow at Theodoret.

The successor of Cyril, Dioscorus, or more properly Dioscuros, who had been archdeacon, was from the first little qualified to adorn the "Evangelical" throne. He was accused in later years, before the Council of Chalcedon, of gross misconduct; the tone of the "libelli" of accusation is not such as to command confidence, but whatever basis of fact underlies them would indicate, at least, that his character had deteriorated, like that of Cyril's own predecessor Theophilus, under the strong temptations of a post of exceptional power. Theodoret, on the other hand, wrote to him soon after his accession to the effect that he had heard much of his "humility."

This communication was obviously intended to propitiate the new archbishop of Alexandria: apparently Theodoret foresaw that new troubles might threaten him from that quarter, and was desirous of counteracting them by producing a favourable impression on Dioscorus. Diplomatic courtesies of this sort were common enough among Eastern bishops; and even effusive protestations of respect and regard must not be taken as having more than a quasi-conventional value. The principle of "economy" was allowed to have a wide application; the habit of calling every bishop "most religious" had gone far to destroy the force of such terms; and language of this sort was like burnished copper currency, which no one literally mistook for gold.

The question of Athanasius of Perrha came up again in 445. We have seen that he had been cited for trial by his metropolitan and friend, Panolbius of Hierapolis, in 443, had resigned and then resumed his see, and had imposed even on Cyril and on Proclus, who wrote in his favour. John succeeded to Panolbius. Councils were called, at which Athanasius ought to have been present, but he would not attend. His deposition was solemnly reaffirmed by a Council of all Syria, held at Antioch in 445; and as John of Hierapolis had died after a short episcopate, Domnus came thither to consecrate Stephen, who on his part constrained one Sabinian to leave his monastery and accept the see of Perrha. Theodoret appears to have attended Stephen's consecration; for he speaks in one letter of having passed many days at Hierapolis. Athanasius would naturally have a grudge against Theodoret; and it is he, probably, whom Theodoret in extant letters describes, without mentioning a name, as an unworthy bishop, who had been excommunicated by Domnus at Antioch, and who had spitefully taken on himself the task of a "delator" by assuring the court that a certain relaxation of the imposts levied on the districts of Cyrrhos had been unreasonable, and that the inhabitants ought to pay more. Theodoret complains bitterly of this conduct as an attack on the unfortunate people, who had already been so ground down by taxation that some had fled and others had been reduced to beggary. Theodoret's practical interest in the temporal troubles of his flock is shown by his statistics as to the dimensions of the diocese of Cyrrhos, and the extent of land which was or was not subject to payment to the treasury.

We have already heard something of Count Irenæus, who had been included in the sentence of banishment to Petra pronounced

against Nestorius, and had there, about 440, written his "Tragedy," or history of the controversy. In that work he had taken up the position that Theodore had only taught what the most illustrious fathers had taught; and that, as Nestorius had simply followed Theodore, Nestorius also had simply followed those fathers. It is therefore the more surprising that, within a few years, he not only reconciled himself to the see of Antioch, and thereby entered into communion with the see of Alexandria—and, in consequence, obtained his recall from the exile which probably had worn out his patience—but so far commended himself to Domnus of Antioch as to be consecrated by him for the metropolitical see of Tyre, in spite not only of his heterodox antecedents but of the serious canonical disqualification of a second marriage. This promotion, which received the approval of Proclus himself and of the chief prelates of Pontus, besides the neighbour-bishops of Palestine, took place apparently between the years 445 and 447. There were doubtless many good points in the character of the new metropolitan: he was generous and beneficent, and Theodoret speaks of him as having befriended persons who had fallen from a prosperous condition into adversity. We are also told not only that he employed the term *Theotocos*—or, as Theodoret says once, that he had "not declined" to use it—but that in letters he had used it without the addition of *Anthropotocos*, and had "expressed in other terms" the idea which the latter term was intended to guard. That he took a serious interest in Biblical studies and in moral questions is proved by the third of Theodoret's letters; while the objection on the ground of his being a "digamist" had been, according to the letter reckoned as the 110th, overruled by a reference to the cases of two bishops, Diogenes and Dominus, consecrated respectively by Alexander of Antioch and Praylius of Jerusalem. It cannot be doubted that the Emperor's consent was somehow obtained; but he was little better than a puppet in the hands of his advisers for the time, and the party which soon reigned in the court of Constantinople was that which might be called the ultra-Cyrrilline, and which was bent on crushing not Nestorianism alone but whatever forms of doctrinal statement were inconsistent with the unqualified maintenance of the phrase "One nature."

That phrase, "One nature (*physis*) of the Word, although this nature had assumed flesh," had, as we have seen, received from Cyril an explanation which made it practically equivalent to the

assertion of the one person of Christ. But many of the monks who had taken an active interest in the Nestorian controversy and warmly sympathized with the earlier line of Cyril cherished the phrase apart from all qualifications and glosses, in the sense of one *nature* absolutely, and had persuaded themselves that any abatement of its force would bring back Nestorianism and undo the work of the Council of Ephesus. The monks, it must be remembered, had been foremost in the movement for the condemnation of the memory of Theodore. They felt that "the snake was scotched, not killed," so long as Theodore's influence was practically powerful in the theological schools of the Orient. But in their zeal against the division or separation which Theodore and Nestorius had introduced they were ready to run into the opposite extreme, and in effect to deny the real and proper manhood of the Christ, lest they should impair the singleness of His Divine personality. These men were not accurate theologians, accustomed to balance the various elements of a composite and mysterious truth. They were for simple, thoroughgoing affirmations; they resembled Nestorius himself in this, that they insisted on one element of the truth, and developed it beyond its due proportion. Misguided reverence was at least one motive which led Nestorius to minimise the Divine condescension; and misguided reverence was signally potent in impelling those who above all things dreaded Nestorianism to use language which virtually de-humanised the Incarnate. They disliked the expression, "The Word assumed manhood," as an interpretation of the text, "The Word became flesh." They avoided even the admission that the Incarnate Lord was of the seed of David, and that He was to be called man. The latter assertion was at least "superfluous," in their view, and open to misconstruction: why not call Him God, since that was the name of His original nature? Was He not the Lord of David? Was not this a worthier title for Him than Son of David? They clung, as for their lives, to the formula that "there were two natures before the union, but only one after it," meaning not that the human nature which existed in Christ had ever existed apart from His person, but that in the abstract, independently of the Incarnation, the Divine and the human "natures" were two, whereas in the Son as Incarnate there was but one nature, the Godhead—the humanity being absorbed into it. To say that there were "two natures" in the Incarnate was, in their view, equivalent to the assertion of "two Sons;" and to this unintelligent confusion

of ideas was added an extraordinary blindness to the destructive effect of their own language on Christian belief in Christ as the Elder Brother, the Second Adam, the Pattern Man, the appropriate Sacrifice, the sympathizing High Priest—in short, on the whole of one side of the Incarnation-mystery.

These opinions were contested by Theodoret in the three celebrated Dialogues which he composed about the year 446–7, and to which he gave the title of “*Eranistes* or *Polymorphos*,” by way of indicating that his opponents—the leaders of the monastic party at Constantinople, and certain clerics of Osrhoene, who, with the monks, were raising an outcry against him as a heretic—had after all no consistent and tenable Christology, but had “picked up scraps” from various heterodox quarters, or laid under contribution various “multiform” theories akin to old forms of Gnostic misbelief. He himself complains of some persons at Edessa, whom he ironically describes as “great lovers of truth,” as having raised a prejudice against him;” and also of persons who, by impairing the reality of the sacred Manhood, were “reviving the heresies of Marcion and Valentinus, of Manes and of the other Docetæ.”

The Dialogues, which are respectively distinguished by the words “Immutable,” “Unconfused,” and “Impassible,” must of course be read in the light of the preceding controversy. In the first, “Orthodox” presses against “*Eranistes*” the fact that in becoming flesh the Word “assumed flesh” or manhood—a point which Proclus had taken before. In the second, the assertion of “two natures before the union, and one after it,” is ingeniously put aside as literally implying the pre-existence of the flesh; the Godhead is shown neither to have undergone any materialising alteration, nor to have absorbed the manhood “as the sea might absorb a drop of honey.” Illustrations are given of interpenetration without fusion; and in one the Eucharistic elements are declared to retain their “nature” after the invocation of the Holy Spirit which consummated their consecration, in opposition to the statement of “*Eranistes*” to the effect that, as the bread and wine were changed into something else after the invocation, so Christ’s body after the Ascension was changed into the divine essence. Theodoret’s answer implies that the analogy between the Eucharist and the Incarnation, admitted on both sides to exist, tells rather in his favour than in his opponent’s; that the outward part in the Eucharist does not lose its reality in consequence of its consecration, and similarly that the humanity of Christ coexists with that

higher nature by combination with which it has been glorified. The argument involves the existence, in both cases, of an outward part as well as an inward, and of an inward part as well as an outward. The passage has sometimes been quoted as if the latter point were at least less important than the former; but certainly this was not the case in Theodoret's view. It is observable that Theodoret, at the close of this dialogue, quotes Cyril's second letter to Nestorius as a theological authority. In the third dialogue, however, he criticizes the statement of Cyril in the last of his articles that the Word suffered in flesh, although its purport is but equivalent to that of 1 Cor. ii. 8, on which he comments, while its truth is implicitly recognised by the admission of "one personality." Yet his object is clear enough from the context: he wishes to emphasize the impassibility of Deity, and, while acknowledging that divine and human properties belong to the one Christ, he contends that suffering affected Him only as Man, and that He "allowed the passible nature, which had become His, to feel it naturally."

It may be asked, whether Theodoret had any one individual in view as the representative of the theory which he was attacking. Perhaps, after all, he had not; for Eutyches himself, the aged archimandrite whose name ere long became attached to that theory, was not a theologian in any proper sense of the term. He had lived for many years within the walls of the monastery over which he presided: it was situated outside the Constantinian walls, but within a short distance of "the heart" of Constantinople; and it contained three hundred monks. At this time he was nearly seventy years old; he had lived in the practice of all monastic virtues; he had probably joined in the Cyrilline or anti-Nestorian demonstration headed by the abbot Dalmatius in the August of 431; he had been favoured by Cyril with a special copy of the acts of the Council of Ephesus; and he was mentioned by the Alexandrian archdeacon Epiphanius, in a letter already mentioned, as one whom Maximian of Constantinople should enlist in the cause of the Reunion, that is, who should be asked to contribute to the pressure which was to be brought to bear on "the Antiochenes," and wring from them a definitive condemnation of Nestorius. Abbot and presbyter though he was, he was not a man to think out a theory; he could only cling doggedly to a formula, and give to such a mind as the great Leo's an impression of "inexperience," of "defect of intelligence," of having "but a dim sense

of the truth." But, says Tillemont, in his stern fashion, "his ignorance, like knowledge in other persons, was accompanied by pride." A synodical letter of Domnus to Theodosius, accusing Eutyches of Apollinarianism on the ground that he called the Godhead and manhood of the Only-begotten "One nature," and thus asserted a confusion and commixture, and also complaining of his having anathematized the memory of Diodore and Theodore, may perhaps be referred to the earlier part of Domnus's episcopate. The abbot probably despised the hostility of the patriarch of Antioch; for he had an ally in one whom he had "raised out of the baptismal font," and of whom it has been said that his conduct shows his opinion on such a subject as the nature of Him who "did no sin" to have been "as valuable as the opinion of an Australian savage concerning the philosophy of Plato." This was that Chrysaphius, high-chamberlain to Theodosius, who, when Flavian succeeded Proclus, probably about the middle of 446, induced the Emperor to demand of him presents under the name of "eulogiæ," whereupon the new bishop sent "white bread as a symbol of his blessing," and on being told that gold was expected, replied manfully that the consecrated vessels were the only gold which the church of Constantinople possessed, and that they could only be disposed of for the relief of the poor. Chrysaphius now set himself to support, with the whole weight of his court influence, the party which looked to Eutyches as its monastic saint, and to the new patriarch of Alexandria as its ecclesiastical chief-tain; which was never tired of denouncing Theodoret as in fact a Nestorian, as the ally of the notorious ex-Nestorian bishop of Tyre, and of the not less obnoxious bishop Ibas of Edessa, who, having succeeded Rabbula, imitated his earlier rather than his later line.

The new bishop of Edessa had already, while only a presbyter, written a letter which was fated to make him a name in history, and to associate itself with a controversy and a schism about a century after his own death. The "Reunion" had taken place; and Ibas—unlike the extreme Nestorianizers, such as Alexander of Hierapolis—had accepted it as satisfactory. In his opinion, as in that of Theodoret and other Orientals, the Reunion was on Cyril's part a virtual retraction of the articles; Cyril had been unquestionably heretical, but now, in effect, he had purged himself of that stain. So, having occasion to write to Maris, a Persian Christian of eminence and perhaps a bishop, he had expressed his mind to the following purport. He described briefly the issue

that had been raised in the original controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, and criticized both as having erred in opposite directions; both had "written noxious books against each other, which were a scandal to the hearers." But he laid greater stress on Cyril's "Apollinarian" articles, which, in his opinion, confounded the manhood with the Godhead, than on the Nestorian denial of the Theotocos. He accused Cyril of having indulged personal animosity, and employed "the drug which blindeth the eyes of the wise" (cf. Exod. xxiii. 8), to get Nestorius condemned without a hearing. He narrated the proceedings of the Orientals; the feud which had lasted so long between the two parties; the tyranny of his own bishop (Rabbula) in daring to anathematize Theodore—"that preacher of the truth," who had "not only converted his own city from error but had instructed distant Churches"—an anathema which was the outcome of a private enmity, for Theodore had once openly refuted him in Council. The Emperor at last had interposed; and John of Antioch, under pressure from the court, had sent Paul of Emesa to Cyril, with instructions to communicate with him if he would condemn those who said that the Godhead had suffered, and that there was one "nature of the Godhead and the Manhood." God had "softened the heart of the Egyptian," so that he readily accepted these terms: peace, accordingly, had been made in the Church, and there was no longer any schism. Maris could see, by the accompanying letters of John and Cyril, that "the wall of partition was broken down"; and those who had been irregularly "attacking the living and the dead" (he alludes to Rabbula and to others) were now put to shame, were asking pardon for their transgressions and retracting their former assertions. No one now maintained that Godhead and Manhood in Christ formed "one nature;" but all acknowledged the temple (*i.e.* the manhood) and Him that inhabited it as being One Son, Jesus Christ.

Such was the letter of Ibas to Maris, which had the strange fate of escaping censure at the Fourth General Council, when taken in connexion with his subsequent anathema against Nestorius, but of being condemned as heretical at the Fifth Council, which treated it as the expression of a Nestorianizing mind, and put the worst construction on the passage about the "temple"—doubtless on account of the abuse which its writer had heaped on the Cyrilline articles. On the death of Rabbula in 435 or 436, "a reactionary wave carried Ibas to the episcopal throne of

Edessa;" but, naturally enough, those of the clergy who had adopted Rabbula's anti-Nestorian position were disgusted at the elevation of his malcontent presbyter, and complained that he was at heart a Nestorian and as such had circulated Syriac translations of the writings of Theodore. The matter came before Proclus, who in 437 wrote to John of Antioch, asking him to persuade Ibas to clear himself by condemning orally and in writing certain propositions extracted from those writings; but as the Orientals generally refused to brand the memory of the admired "Expositor," it is not to be supposed that Ibas would consent to do so. There for a time the matter rested.

But some four presbyters of Edessa, Samuel, Maras, Cyrus, and Eulogius, were bitterly hostile to Ibas, and watched their opportunity to strike a blow at his credit and his position. Samuel had used language on the Divine condescension in the Incarnation such as, at least, required explanation: "Life died." Ibas gently remonstrated with him: "My friend, if you mean that the Lord's flesh is life-giving, and that Christ is our life, I agree with you; but if you mean by 'life' the Godhead, I cannot accept the statement that it died." After this, according to Ibas, Samuel communicated with him for ten years, as if he entirely accepted the distinction. Samuel, however, gave a very different account of the matter. What is certain is, that when in 445 Domnus of Antioch went to Hierapolis to consecrate Stephen, bishop-elect of that city—which was at no great distance from Edessa—Cyrus and Eulogius hastened thither in order to present an accusation against their own bishop. When Ibas, who was preparing to set forth for Hierapolis, heard of this proceeding, he assembled the clergy, and announced that the two accusers were out of his communion and that he suspended from communion any of their brethren who had, in writing, adhered to their act—adding that he had heard that thirty were thus implicated. That Samuel and Maras had been concerned in it, was certain; the question as to how many more was afterwards a matter of dispute. What steps were taken by Domnus at Hierapolis, we know not: either then or somewhat later he seems to have held a sort of private inquiry in his official room or "secretarium;" but before matters had come to a crisis, the Eutychianizers had already struck successfully at the bishops of Cyrrhos and Tyre.

Theodoret was their most formidable adversary, and they accordingly determined to put him down. It was probably in 447 that

Dioscorus of Alexandria wrote to Domnus to the effect that certain persons who had arrived at the capital of Egypt had denounced the bishop of Cyrrhos as a divider of Christ into two Sons. He also wrote to Theodoret himself, assuming the truth of this charge: whereupon Theodoret deemed it wise to write to Dioscorus, complaining gravely of the injustice done him. In this letter he says that his doctrinal teaching was attested by multitudes of hearers: he had preached at Antioch during six continuous years under Theodotus, and during thirteen years under John, both of whom had warmly approved his sermons, and the same habit had been continued during the six years of Domnus's primacy. Theodoret adds an elaborate statement of belief in the unity of Christ's person, including a severe censure on all who rejected the name Theotocos. He protested that he employed the writings of Cyril as a theological authority, and that he had been in friendly correspondence with him before his death. He concluded by a solemn imprecation on all who should divide the Only-begotten into two Sons. But Dioscorus was not to be appeased; he had his programme and his purpose; and when those who had accused Theodoret at Alexandria went so far as to anathematize him in full church, the patriarch rose and with a loud voice confirmed their words. He also sent a bishop to Constantinople to prove the same charge. Theodoret requested a bishop named Basil to "set truth in opposition to falsehood." He sent also to the bishops of Cilicia a brief vindication of his faith; and to Eusebius of Ancyra a compendious account of his teaching on the Incarnation. But, beside the question of orthodoxy, he was also represented, or rather misrepresented, as having got up meetings of bishops and disturbed the peace of the Church, though he had never, he tells us, gone even to an Antiochene synod except in obedience to a summons, nor had he nor any of his clergy, during an episcopate of twenty-five years, appeared in the civil courts. However, on this ground, an imperial monition addressed to Zeno, the commander of the forces in Syria, commanded him to take care that Theodoret should stay at Cyrrhos, and not visit any other city, but discharge his own episcopal duties. The date of this mandate may be the beginning of 448. Zeno, who had just become consul and had thereupon received a congratulatory letter from Theodoret, passed on the order, and it was shown to Theodoret when the latter was staying at some place outside his diocese. He obeyed the order by going home, and promised to confine himself to his own diocese; but he

wrote to the patrician Anatolius, asking him to inquire whether the order was genuine, and if so, what was its real motive—and also to urge Theodosius not to condemn him unheard. He did not, he said, dislike Cyrrhos, but felt it hard to stay there under compulsion. If he had given offence by “deploring” the troubles of the Phœnician Churches (*i.e.* apparently, the attack which had already begun on the position of his friend Irenæus as bishop of Tyre), it was impossible not to sympathize with the tears and grief of Christians on that account; nor could he, while he lived, conceal his sentiments. In another letter he complains that while heretics and pagans and Jews were free to go about whither they would, he was debarred from entering any city except his own. He urged that he might have opportunity to defend himself before a court composed of bishops *and* civil officers “instructed in things Divine.” He protested that he was not eager to go out of his own diocese; he loved quiet; the restrictive order, in itself, was to him welcome, as procuring for him that boon: but it was oppressive in its motive and in the aims which it indicated; it was the symbol of a tyrannizing policy, to be carried out in the interests of erroneous teaching. Theodoret’s complaints, says Tillemont, are free from meanness and weakness; and it is not from an ignoble egotism, but in grave and earnest self-defence, that in some of these letters he recalls the benefits which he had conferred upon his city, the active missionary labours by which he had cleared his diocese of heresy, and the list of his works—on the Prophets, the Psalter, the Pauline Epistles, against Arians, Macedonians, and Marcionites, a book on “the Mysteries” or sacraments, one on Providence, one on questions put by the Magi of Persia, and Lives of the Saints. These he enumerates by way of challenge to the accusers of his doctrine: let them examine everything that he has written. But it was to no purpose: he was denounced at Constantinople as a Nestorianizer; and he thereupon wrote again to Anatolius, almost passionately expressing his weariness of heart. If he were free to leave Cyrrhos, he would spend the rest of his days in some far-distant solitude. A letter to Eusebius the “advocate,” perhaps written about this time, alludes to a rumour of greater severities which he might expect, and declares that he is ready to endure the worst for the sake of truth, even irrespectively of the promised reward.

The next attack was directed by the Eutychianizers from Constantinople against the obnoxious bishop of Tyre. It was carried

on for some time by methods of annoyance to which Theodoret alludes in several of his letters; at last there came forth a "law" proscribing the works of Porphyry and of Nestorius, and concluding thus: "And that all may learn by experience how our Divinity" (!) "abhors those who adopt the impious belief of Nestorius, we ordain that Irenæus, who formerly incurred our indignation on this account, and afterwards, we know not how (although, as we learn, he had twice married), was made bishop of Tyre contrary to the Apostolic rules, shall be expelled from the Church of Tyre, and live only in his own country, wholly deprived of the garb and the title of a bishop." This law was summarised in an edict promulgated by the prefects; and—doubtless by the express order of Dioscorus—was "read in the church of the monks dwelling in the deserts" of Egypt on Low Sunday, April 18th, 448. Domnus heard from Constantinople that he would be required to consecrate a new bishop of Tyre. He sent word to Theodoret, who was already by imperial order confined to Cyrrhos. Theodoret, in reply, professed to have some doubt as to the correctness of the news. Could the Emperor really intend this? If he did, why did he not write to Domnus himself? And Theodoret had, for his own part, received intelligence from Constantinople, which seemed to indicate that Irenæus would be more favourably regarded by the Emperor. He sketched for Domnus a draft of a letter, which might be written to the archbishop's informants at Constantinople: he suggested, also, that the opinion of the bishops of Palestine should be taken before writing. But it appears that Domnus was too timid to make any resistance to the Emperor's will; and it is certain that a bishop named Photius was recognised as in lawful possession of the see of Tyre as early as October of 448. Theodoret, indeed, ignored his claim to the see by writing to "bishop Irenæus" in the summer of 449.

Meanwhile, in the Lent of 448, Domnus had found himself obliged to take regular cognisance of the affair of Ibas. The four priests presented a formal charge against him: the record tells us that they imputed to their bishop an apparently most blasphemous statement, "I do not grudge Christ His having become God: for in so far as He has become God, so have I too." Domnus sent word to Ibas to come and defend himself at Antioch "after the day," *i.e.* after Easter, since Lent was close at hand; and desired him also to take off the censure which he had pronounced on the four priests. Ibas answered, "I leave that matter in your

hands." Domnus thereupon provisionally restored the accusers to communion, on condition that they should not leave Antioch until they had regularly maintained their charge: if they failed to observe this condition, they would incur an aggravated penalty. Ibas made use of the interval in getting up a declaration on the part of the Edessene clergy in his own favour. About eighteen declined to sign it; by Ibas's account, because they had previously taken part in the accusation brought against him; by his accusers', because they said they could not assert a falsehood and might be asked questions as to his orthodoxy.

After Easter the Council met at Antioch: the extant signatures are only nine in number (according to the Greek text of the record), but perhaps the list is not complete. Before Ibas arrived, two of his accusers, Samuel and Cyrus, had gone off to Constantinople: the Council therefore asked Maras and Eulogius, "Where were they who had joined in the presentation of the charge?" "They have departed, we know not whither, in apprehension of Ibas's intrigues. . . . We have heard that they are gone to Constantinople; but we have received no letter from them and we have no precise information." Domnus remarked that they had no cause for alarm: Ibas had given him full discretion as to relieving them from censures; they now, by breaking the condition on which he had granted relief, proved themselves deserters, despisers of his "apostolic throne," and had incurred the additional penalty of deposition. In their absence nothing was decided with regard to Ibas: it was afterwards said that, on his return home, he employed his Church stewards to prosecute an aged priest who had refused to sign the declaration in his favour, whereupon the judge, though disposed to gratify Ibas, was fain to acquit the prisoner, "and the whole city welcomed him home again with tapers and lamps."

Eulogius and Maras quickly followed Samuel and Cyrus to Constantinople, and were themselves followed by another Maras, a deacon, and by Ablavius and four other clerics of Edessa. They obtained the support of Eutyches and others of his set. They addressed the Emperor not only against Ibas, but also against two neighbouring bishops, Daniel of Carrhæ, nephew of Ibas, and John of Theodosiopolis; and they appealed also to the archbishop Flavian, complained of Domnus's partiality, denounced Theodoret, although he had befriended them, as a Nestorianizer, and produced an agitation in the imperial city. Flavian received the accusers

favourably, and, apparently, went beyond his province in the direction of overruling the sentence of deposition pronounced by Domnus against Samuel and Cyrus. Domnus was probably an object of some suspicion to the ruling powers of Constantinople: his previous warning as to the unsoundness of Eutyches had been associated with a vindication of the orthodoxy of Theodore; it would be easy to contend that he was a tool of Nestorianizers. He on his part wrote to Flavian an explanatory letter; and the Emperor, with Flavian's assent, on October 26, appointed a commission of three bishops—Uranus of Himeria (a strong opponent of Ibas, who was then at Constantinople), Photius the new occupant of the see of Tyre, and Eustathius of Berytus—to hear and determine the cause. The mandate addressed to Damascius, "tribune and notary of the prætorians," directing him to bring Ibas and the other accused prelates into Phœnicia for trial, is dated on the 26th of October, 448. The whole proceeding is a good illustration of imperial absolutism in matters affecting the Eastern Church.

The record, as read at the Council of Chalcedon, says that the commissioners sat in the new episcopal house at Berytus, in presence of Damascius, of the three accused bishops and of the ten accusers. Flavian sent his deacon Eulogius to represent him. Damascius opened the proceedings; Eulogius described Flavian's part in the business; and after it had been arranged that Uranus should have the aid of a Syriac interpreter, Ibas was requested to state what had happened at Antioch. He did so: Samuel challenged his accusers as to the censure alleged to have been incurred by himself and Cyrus; the record of the Antiochene Council was read. Then the newly framed "libellus" of the four priests was read: they were ordered to go further into particulars; they produced a string of charges eighteen in number and very miscellaneous. Some imputed to Ibas a misappropriation of Church property: he had kept out of the Church treasury a rich jewelled chalice presented by a holy man eleven years before; he had handed over the ecclesiastical revenues, and gifts of great value offered for the Church's use, to his own relations; he had even spent on their dwellings the funds raised for redemption of captives. He was furthermore charged with simony, with ordaining grossly unfit persons, and particularly his nephew Daniel, whom he made bishop of "the city of the Pagans" (Carrhæ) although his scandalous profligacy was notorious. Only one count,

the eleventh, touched on dogma: "He is a Nestorian, and calls the blessed bishop Cyril a heretic." Three charges, said Samuel, were pre-eminently grave; the first was that which affected the faith. Then Maras quoted the saying, "I do not grudge Christ." Ibas indignantly denied that he had ever said so; he would rather be cut to pieces a thousand times. "Well, what was the proof?" "It is the custom with us," Samuel said in effect, "that on Easter-day, or before it, the bishop gives some festival-gifts to the clergy with his own hand, after making an address. About three years ago, on such an occasion, Ibas uttered those words. Many heard it, and here are three present who did so. We can name others." Ibas answered, "There are about two hundred clergy, more or less, at Edessa: the clergy have, in a letter to Domnus, attested my orthodoxy; should not their testimony outweigh the charge brought by a few?" Samuel was called upon to name the three witnesses then present. They were David, Maras, and Sabbas, three deacons. Ibas made a remark as to Maras; and then ensued a dispute between himself and Samuel, as to the latter's former assertion, "Life died." The judges recalled the parties to the matter in hand: "Who has heard Ibas utter the blasphemy? must not all the clergy have been present?" Eulogius answered, "Many people are afraid to testify against Ibas. He has persecuted one who would not sign the declaration in his favour. Others have been forced to sign it on peril of excommunication." "Not so," said Ibas; "some fifteen had excommunicated themselves when I suspended from communion the partisans of my accusers." He repeated that he anathematized any one who should utter such a blasphemy as he never heard even from a demon—*i.e.* in exorcism. As for the speech about Cyril, he pleaded that if he ever did call Cyril a heretic, it was when the "Oriental" Council anathematized him: he had acted with his exarch (or patriarch)—meaning John; and this was before Cyril had explained his own meaning and reconciled himself to the Orientals. "Can you prove," said the judges to the accusers, "that he ever called Cyril a heretic *after* the Reunion?" Ibas here remarked that after Cyril had "interpreted his articles," he was in communion and friendly correspondence with him: no one then called Cyril a heretic. The accuser Maras said, "Last year he said he had regarded Cyril as a heretic until he anathematized his own articles." "We all deemed him a heretic," said Ibas, "until he held private communications with John and accepted the formulary conveyed by

Paul." Samuel insisted that Ibas was glossing and qualifying his own statement: and at this point the letter of Ibas to Maris was read. It does not appear how this document could prove anything, for the heterodoxy which it imputes to Cyril is treated as a thing of the past, not to say that it was written several years before Cyril's death. A paper addressed to the commissioners by sixty-three clerics of Edessa, and dated shortly before Easter, affirmed that they had never heard of their bishop's having uttered the blasphemy attributed to him, and that, if they had continued to communicate or to officiate with one who had uttered it, they would have incurred the extremest penalties. They entreated the judges to send back Ibas in time to perform the solemnities of the ensuing Easter. According to the probable view, the proceedings at Berytus were inconclusive: the trial was adjourned to a subsequent day, and was concluded at Tyre, when the commissioners heard further evidence on the same point adduced by priests and monks from Mesopotamia. Ibas again denied the charge: the judges, as Photius told the story at Chalcedon, endeavoured to mediate, and allayed the indignation caused in the city by "the grossness of the blasphemy, and the importunity" of these new accusers, by desiring them to depart from Tyre, and then effected a sort of reconciliation between Ibas and his accusers, which was sealed by their joint reception of the Eucharist. A formal record was drawn up, which bears the date of 25th February, "after the consulate of Flavius Zeno and Postumianus." It makes Tyre the scene, and says nothing about any proceedings at Berytus: it dwells solely on the charge of heresy; and after describing the assurances given on this point by Ibas, including a promise to anathematize Nestorius, it states the terms of the reconciliation. "We persuaded Ibas to receive the aforesaid persons as his own children, and we persuaded them to meet him as a father." Ibas was solemnly enjoined to "grant oblivion" to those who had offended him, and never to visit their offence by official penalties or by passing-over of seniority, but to treat all with impartial kindness; and of his own accord he promised to administer the funds of his Church by stewards appointed from among his clergy, after the custom of the Church of Antioch. It was added that even if he had just reason for displeasure with any of the four chief accusers, he should punish them, not on his own authority, but by the judgment of archbishop Domnus, "on account of the previous ill-feeling." The document was signed by

Photius and Eustathius (Uranius's name does not appear) and by the *quondam* accusers; but Ibas does not sign. So ended the trial by imperial commissioners: the accused prelate was clearly acquitted, and treated as an orthodox member of the episcopal body.

But all this was far from abating the agitation in Ibas's own city. His life was not safe on his return, and he again quitted Edessa. An imperial order for a new trial was procured; it was to be carried out by the count Chæreas, president of the province of Osrhoene, of which Edessa was the capital. He was met on his arrival, April 12, 449, by a crowd of monks in a white heat of anti-Nestorian and savagely personal wrath, whose recorded outcries are such as to make their "zeal" for Christ's divinity a portentous sample of self-deceit. "No one will have a Judas for his bishop! To the gallows with the new Iscariot! To the fire with the race of Ibas!" Other charges beside those which touched on doctrine were brought forward: "Ibas has falsified the text of Cyril's writings;" "he has appropriated the linen of St. Barbara's church." But the main stress was laid on the profane dictum which Ibas had disowned, and another was quoted, "It was but a mere man that the Jews crucified." Of course there was no question of seriously examining and judicially estimating the charges: if Chæreas had wished to do so, he would himself have become a mark for popular fury. The sentence, therefore, pronounced on April 18, was a foregone conclusion: it was duly reported to, and duly confirmed by, Theodosius; Eutyches instigated Chrysaphius to procure Ibas's banishment to forty stations' distance, and he ere long acquired considerable experience of the variety of "Oriental" places of imprisonment.

CHAPTER XLIV.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN 448.

BEFORE the expulsion of Ibas had been finally brought about, as described at the end of the last chapter, signs of effective opposition to the movement associated with the name of Eutyches had begun indeed to show themselves. But down to the summer of 448 that movement had hardly experienced any serious check. Eutyches himself had for some years enjoyed the reputation of a saintly ascetic and of a zealous defender of orthodoxy. He was looked up to by the whole monastic party as the vigilant guardian of the Cyrilline tradition, who might be trusted to detect and denounce all tendencies to the condemned Nestorian heresy. His hand had been at work, we cannot doubt, in the movements against Ibas and Irenæus and Theodoret. Early in 448 Theodoret had been forbidden to set foot outside his own small diocese: almost immediately afterwards Irenæus had been, as far as the Emperor's will could effect it, deposed: the measures against Ibas were in full swing by about Easter in the same year. Eutyches was naturally full of confidence as to the future progress of the campaign against Nestorianizers. Domnus of Antioch, once so bold as to accuse him to the Emperor on the score of a revival of Apollinarianism, had now small chance of exerting influence to his detriment; Dioscorus of Alexandria was definitely his ally. There remained Leo of Rome, and to Leo Eutyches wrote in the May of 448, informing him in general terms that certain persons were reviving the Nestorian heresy. Leo replied on the 1st of June, gravely commending his "dear son's" solicitude on behalf of orthodoxy, assuring him that it would receive assistance from the Divine Author of the Catholic faith, but intimating that he would require more particular information as to the persons

referred to, before he could take any action in the way of extirpating the pest.

When Eutyches received this letter, he could hardly have anticipated that he would himself, within a few months, be invoking Leo's help against an ecclesiastical censure pronounced on the ground of his having erred from the faith in a direction opposite to the Nestorian. Yet so it was; and there was a special significance in the fact that this censure was originally procured by one who had been among the very first to make a stand against Nestorius, and who could, therefore, speak with more weight against the extremes of anti-Nestorian reaction. This was Eusebius, who, as a layman and a barrister at Constantinople, had opened the campaign against Nestorius by a public declaration in the early part of 429, in which the opinions of the then bishop of Constantinople were (mistakenly indeed) identified with those of the heresiarch Paul of Samosata. Since those days, he had become bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia; he had never slackened in his theological zeal, and, as an anti-Nestorian, had formed a friendship with Eutyches himself. But when he came to the conclusion that the archimandrite was wresting Cyril's words, and exaggerating Cyril's theory, in a sense inconsistent with any true belief in Christ's manhood, he did not hesitate between his friendship and his duty. "Not once nor twice," but oftener, he tried the effect of personal remonstrance with Eutyches; but he found that admonition was thrown away. Eutyches stuck to his own position, employed language which to Eusebius appeared "incompatible with the right faith," and even taxed him with Nestorian heresy. The latter, thereupon, had recourse to Flavian as archbishop. Flavian was an intimate friend of Eusebius, and, what was more, had reason to dislike at least one of the court-magnates on whose support Eutyches could reckon: but, as we have seen, he had listened somewhat too readily to the violent adversaries of the bishop of Edessa, whom Eutyches would represent as an arch-Nestorian; he had recently consecrated the altar of Eutyches's own monastic church; and he strongly deprecated a new controversy, which would bring him into collision with the monastic party, and might not improbably give an advantage to whatever force survived in Nestorianism. He might think that to accuse a zealous anti-Nestorian of confounding the Godhead and the Manhood sounded very much like a repetition of the charges so pertinaciously brought against Cyril while he was at feud with the

Oriental. Surely it was not well to rekindle the smouldering fire; surely the safer course was to put the best interpretation on words which a zealous but unlearned monk had used in the fervour of his loyalty to the doctrine of the Hypostatic Union. Accordingly, we have his own word for it that he tried to pacify Eusebius. "Do not press the matter, I beg of you; let it rest." In vain: Eusebius was firmly persuaded that he must contend earnestly against one extreme, just as he had led the way in denouncing the other.

There were then, as often happened, some bishops staying at Constantinople for purposes connected with their own Churches: a custom had grown up whereby such prelates assembled round the bishop of Constantinople and discussed various Church matters in a meeting which, though irregular in its formation, acquired by degrees the name of the "sojourning synod," and greatly assisted the growth of Constantinopolitan authority. A dispute had just at this time broken out between Florentius, metropolitan of Sardis, and two of his suffragans, Cossinius and John, bishops of Hierocæsarea and of Hyrcanis. The two latter had repaired to Constantinople: Florentius had sent certain clerics of his, with his own statement of the case. The archbishop invited the other bishops to consider it in the "secretarium" or business-room of his palace. They assembled accordingly on Monday, November 8, 448. The documents were read and a decision was given; and the bishops probably supposed that they might now disperse, when Eusebius, who was one of them, rose and presented a "libellus" or formal indictment, which he conjured his brethren to hear read. Even then, it would seem, Flavian attempted to quash the matter; but Eusebius persisted, and Flavian had no choice but to order the presbyter and notary Asterius to read the paper, in which Eusebius vehemently complained of Eutyches for having "moved his blasphemous tongue against Christ," and for having applied the name of "heretic" to approved "fathers" and to the complainant himself, who had never been even suspected of heresy but on the contrary had always fought against heretics, and who adhered to the doctrine of the Nicene Council, to the acts of the Ephesian Council, and to the teaching of Cyril, of the great Athanasius, "of Gregory, of Gregory, of Gregory" (meaning the three Gregories of Neocæsarea, Nazianzus, and Nyssa), of Atticus, and of Proclus. He therefore supplicated his colleagues to summon Eutyches before them, that the latter might meet the charges which he

had to bring forward. "For I am ready to convict him as being a mere pretender to the reputation of orthodoxy and as wholly alien from the orthodox faith, and I conjure you by the holy and consubstantial Trinity, who preserves our Christ-loving Emperors, and by the safety and permanence of our most pious Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, always august, to command Eutyches to attend your holy synod and to defend himself against my accusations; so that, after I shall have convicted him, those who have been misled by him may be set right, and the orthodox faith may even now be seen to triumph." After the reading of this "libellus," he set his hand to it in due form.

Flavian then spoke. He was astounded at what they had just heard, whereby "the most pious presbyter and archimandrite Eutyches" was subjected to so grave a censure. He suggested that Eusebius should confer with him; and, if he were then found to be heterodox, that would be the right time to summon him before the synod. Eusebius answered that, having been a friend of Eutyches, he had repeatedly tried to bring him right; but he could appeal to many who had been present at these conferences whether Eutyches had not remained obstinate. Let him be sent for now, to come and answer; and when convicted, let him cease to mislead many as he had done by perverse teaching. Flavian again, almost humbly, begged Eusebius to take the trouble of visiting the monastery and suggesting to Eutyches what was befitting and what tended to peace. No, Eusebius said, he could not revisit Eutyches after his previous failures; let the Council summon Eutyches to its presence. "For I cannot allow such a matter to be left unexamined." The bishops answered that Eusebius ought to have complied with the request of the archbishop. "But since we see you persist, what you have desired shall be done. Only your formal charges must be recorded in our minutes, in order to an accurate examination of the case." It was agreed that John, a presbyter, and official "advocate" of the Church of Constantinople, with a deacon named Andrew, should visit Eutyches, exhibit to him the "libellus" of Eusebius, and summon him to attend the Council and defend himself on the grave charge brought against him. To our notions the strange thing about the matter in this stage is that the "libellus" contained no definite charge. A modern court would certainly have told Eusebius that he must not affirm vaguely, or even offer to prove generally, that Eutyches was heterodox, but must say plainly what kind of error

he imputed to Eutyches, and by what kind of evidence he proposed to establish the imputation.

The Council adjourned, and after allowing an interval of four days reassembled on Friday the 12th of November. Eusebius made a long speech, intended to meet at the very outset all imputations of "Nestorianizing." He asked that a certain theological epistle of Cyril to Nestorius might be read; it had been read at the Council of Ephesus, and all who sat in that synod pronounced it to be orthodox: he for his part adhered to it. There was also a second letter of Cyril, addressed to the synod of the Orientals, when a treaty took place between him and them; let that also be read. Here let us pause to observe, that, as the records show, the first letter mentioned by Eusebius was what we call the "second letter of Cyril" to Nestorius: he entirely passes over the third letter, to which were appended the Twelve Articles, and a clearer proof could not be given that he, at any rate, did not regard the third letter as possessing the authority of the Ephesian Council. It is, indeed, surprising to see how absolutely he leaves it out of his reckoning; for he calls the epistle to John, *Lætentur Cæli*, "Cyril's second letter;" it is really the *third* of his great theological letters. Flavian remarked that these documents were well known, and were "daily read with profit" by the faithful; still, there was no objection to Eusebius's proposal. They were read accordingly, and entered in the minutes. Eusebius requested the Council to signify its solemn assent to their teaching, that all might know that whosoever might "weaken its force" would be deemed "an enemy of the Church and alien from the priestly assembly;" and Flavian then declared that the letters of Cyril just read were a correct expression of the Nicene faith, and set forth "that which we have always held and still hold"—to the effect that "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, was perfect God and perfect Man, of a rational soul and a body, having been as to His Godhead begotten of the Father before the ages without beginning, but at the end and in the last times, the Selfsame, for us and for our salvation born of Mary the Virgin as to His manhood; co-essential with the Father as to His Godhead, co-essential with His Mother as to His Manhood. For we confess that Christ, after the Incarnation, is of (from) two natures, in one hypostasis and one person; we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. And those who do not choose to think thus we exclude from the holy assembly of priests and from the whole body of the Church."

Here we may observe that Flavian adopts, for the most part, the language of the Formulary of Reunion, but yet makes some changes : *e.g.* he inserts the phrase “without beginning;” he says “co-essential with His Mother,” instead of “with us,” which was somewhat of a backward step; on the other hand, instead of saying merely that an “union of two natures” took place, he goes further, and says—what, indeed, the Formulary implied—that Christ as Incarnate was “of two natures :” an expression by which he clearly meant that the Lord Jesus had existed and did exist in two spheres of being, without prejudice to His single and Divine personality ; a meaning which was afterwards elucidated by the change of a preposition, when “of (from) two natures” was altered into “in two natures” in Flavian’s own later confession and in the final draft of the dogmatic formulary of Chalcedon. In fact, Basil of Seleucia, who followed Flavian in the order of speaking, actually used the phrase “in two natures,” and Seleucus of Amasia did the like. Longinus of Chersonesus repeated Flavian’s phrase “of two natures;” a Western-born prelate, Julian of Cos, who was pope Leo’s agent for Roman Church affairs at Constantinople, said, “We confess the two natures in one person :” other bishops intimated in various ways their adhesion to the teaching of Cyril, one of them affirming that John of Antioch, “the leader of the Orient, had followed Cyril.” Finally, Eusebius requested that, since some bishops then staying at Constantinople were absent from the Council, either through ill health or through want of information as to its meeting, they might be made acquainted with the proceedings and enabled to signify their assent; and this was agreed to.

The Council held its third sitting on Monday the 15th of November; the two messengers who had been deputed at the first sitting, a week before, to visit Eutyches reported that they went to the monastery, read the memorial in the hearing of the abbot, and summoned him on the part of the Council to attend. He answered to this effect : “I have made a resolution never to leave my community in order to go anywhere; it is a rule which I have all along observed. Tell the Council that Eusebius is an old enemy of mine, and has made up this charge simply in order to insult and vilify me. I am ready to adhere to the dogmas of Nicæa and Ephesus: if in them there is any error, I do not censure it nor do I accept it; I ‘search the Scriptures’ alone, as more sure than the expositions of the fathers. After the Incarnation, that

is, after the Nativity of our Lord, I adore one 'nature,' and that the 'nature' of God incarnate and made man." He produced and read from a book, to the same purport. Thus far, then, he was *verbally* in accordance with Cyril. He added, "Some have vilified me by saying that I have asserted that the Word brought down His flesh with Him from heaven. I am not amenable to this false charge. But that our Lord was born of two natures personally united, is a statement which I never found in the expositions of the fathers; nor do I accept it, if anything of the kind should prove to have been said by any one: for Scripture, as I have said, is better than the teaching of the fathers." He admitted that the Virgin-born was "perfect God and perfect Man." But when John the "advocate," speaking to him in a low voice as if apart, asked him whether he owned the Word to be co-essential with the Father as to Godhead, *and* with us as to Manhood, Eutyches asked, "What says the Creed?" "Co-essential with the Father," said John. "Hold to that," said Eutyches, "for so do I too;" and he added, still speaking to John aside, that Christ was indeed "co-essential with His Mother," or "had a flesh co-essential with his Mother, but not with *us*." This closed the conversation. A deacon attending on Basil of Seleucia, Athanasius by name, had been present at this conference, and confirmed on the whole the statements of John and Andrew. Eusebius now moved for a second citation; it was put into writing, and committed to two priests, Mamas and Theophilus. When they were gone, Eusebius stood forth in the midst, and said he had learned that Eutyches had been circulating a "tome" among the inmates of the monasteries. Let Abraham, the priest of the "martyr" of Hebdomon, be examined as to the fact. Abraham accordingly appeared; he was in readiness. Was Eusebius's statement true? asked Flavian. He answered, "Emmanuel the archimandrite sent me to Asterius the presbyter, to tell him that Eutyches had sent *him* a 'tome' on doctrine, and was trying to get him to sign it. He intended Asterius to report this to your Holinesses." Messengers were directed to inquire at the monasteries; Peter and Patrick at those in the city, Rhetorius and Eutropius at those at Sycæ over the water, Paul and John at Chalcedon. Mamas and Theophilus now returned. They had asked the monks whom they saw at the door of Eutyches's monastery to tell the archimandrite that they brought a message from the synod. "The lord archimandrite is ill," said the monks, "and cannot see you. Tell us what you have to communicate." "No, our business is with

him: we have written instructions." The monks went in, and returned with another monk, Eleusinius, who was introduced to them as deputed by Eutyches to receive the message. The messengers again refused to deal with Eutyches through a third person; the monks, perplexed, began to whisper to each other. The messengers asked, "Why are you so disturbed? Nothing unpleasant is involved; we have no secrets,—we have to obey our instructions written down, and to tell Eutyches what they contain. See, it is a second citation from the synod." A second parleying produced a message that Eutyches would see the envoys. The citation was read to him; he had recourse to his evasions. He had a rule against going outside the monastery; let him not be troubled again upon that point; the synod and the archbishop knew he was old and worn out; he would take this second as if it were a third citation; let them do what they thought fit, without more formality. Eutyches had a written paper of his own, which he signed and wished the messengers to take charge of, to be read to the Council. From a later passage in the minutes it appears that he entered on a theological discussion in the presence of another abbot named Maximus. "What is the Scriptural authority for two natures?" Mamas and Theophilus retorted, "Do *you* show us what Scripture asserts the Homousion!" "It is in the exposition of the fathers," said Eutyches. "Well, the fathers have also in their expositions affirmed two natures." Theophilus also asked, "Is God the Word perfect?" "Yes." "Is the Incarnate perfect man?" "Yes,"—Eutyches admitted this. "If, then, two perfects thus make up one Son, what hinders us from saying 'one Son from two natures'?" "Be it far from me," said Eutyches, "to say that Christ is from two natures, or to speculate about my God." He could not say "two natures:" he must stand by the belief which he had always held; he intended to die in it. "If they wish to depose me, or take any measures against me, they must do what God permits; if I am condemned, let my monastery be my tomb!"

It was resolved, notwithstanding Eutyches's deprecation of a third citation as useless, to send it by Memnon the sacrist, Epiphanius, and a deacon named Germanus. The Council adjourned until the next day, Tuesday the 16th, when an abbot named Abraham, and three deacons from Eutyches's monastery, appeared with a message from Eutyches himself. "He is ill," said Abraham. "By your prayers!" (*i.e.* so surely as you are

pious men) "he could not sleep at all last night for groaning; and his groans kept me awake too. For in the evening he called me to him on this account: he told me to say something to my lord" (the archbishop). "We do not want to press hard on him," replied Flavian; "it is God's part to make him well, ours to wait till he is well. Our object is not to cut off any one, but to increase" (the number of the true members of the Church): "we are not children of inhumanity, but of the philanthropy of God. For if 'He who was rich became poor for our sakes,' we also are bound to follow His lofty poverty; for we are constituted by God for deeds of philanthropy." Abraham proposed to deliver his message; but Flavian asked how, when one man was the accused, another could speak for him? If Eutyches would come, he would be coming to fathers and brethren, to men not ignorant of the faith, and, moreover, to men who still clung to his friendship. "Many have heard him and have been scandalized. His accuser presses the charge, and he ought to defend himself. If once, when Nestorius opposed the truth, he (Eutyches) came forward in its behalf, much more ought he now to come forward for the truth and for himself. Repentance," he added, "does not bring confusion; the disgrace is in adhering to sin. Let him come, and we will condone the past, if he confesses his error and anathematizes it; and let him give the synod guarantees for the future, that he adheres to the exposition of the fathers, and will not teach, or speak to any one, otherwise. This is his duty, I assure you." He added, with a touch of tenderness which reveals his character, "I knew him before you did: he knew me before he knew you!" Abraham was moved: "It is so, by your feet!" The synod again adjourned; and Flavian said to the monastic delegates, "You know how zealous the prosecutor (Eusebius) is. Fire itself seems cold to him. God knows, I exhorted and entreated him not to press this charge; but when he would press it, what could I do? Do I wish any of you to be dispersed abroad? God forbid! do I not rather desire to gather you together? To disperse is the part of enemies; to unite is that of fathers."

In the fifth session, held on the 17th of November, the bearers of the third citation were examined. It appeared that Eutyches, on receiving them, had referred to the message which he had sent by Abraham, and the tenor of which was that he would adhere to the Nicene and Ephesian decisions, and to the *whole* writings of Cyril—meaning apparently to include those in which Cyril had

spoken of "one nature incarnate." Eusebius broke in with the natural though impatient question, "What of the past? Am I to be nonsuited, if he now, under pressure, signs a formulary?" Flavian tried to calm him: "No one wants to make you withdraw your charge, or to excuse him from defending himself for the past." "Let me not be prejudiced by this offer of his," cried Eusebius: "I have witnesses to prove that he has repeatedly persisted in his errors in spite of my frequent admonitions. Tell a set of convicts in prison, 'Don't rob for the future!'—of course they will all promise." Flavian reiterated his assurances. Memnon resumed his report, how Eutyches had pleaded ill-health as his reason for sending Abraham, and how, when pressed to come in person, he fell back on his expectation of something to be gained by Abraham's influence with the archbishop and the synod, and at last had asked for a week's delay. Next Monday he would really come, and make his defence. Eusebius then asked for a report of the deputations sent to the several monasteries. It appeared that Peter and Patrick had visited one under the rule of abbot Martin. He had received a formulary, brought to him on the 12th of November from Eutyches. He had refused to sign it: such signature was for bishops, not for him. The messenger, apparently, had said to him, as from Eutyches, "The bishop will crush you in time if he succeeds in crushing me." "What," asked Flavian, "did the paper contain?" A profession of adherence, so they had been told, to the acts of Ephesus: the paper was signed, but they were not allowed to read the signatures. Another abbot named Faustus said that two messengers had brought him a "tome" to sign, describing it as the creed of the 318 and also of the Ephesian Council. He had said, "We have copies of these documents; let us see whether yours has had any additions made in it:" they refused, and departed. Another said he had only been told that the archbishop would send round a "tome" for signatures, and had been warned not to sign it. In two other quarters no tome had been received. Eusebius again rose, and pressed the Council to pass sentence: surely here was proof enough against Eutyches to make a defence impossible; he was scheming to gain time; his promise to attend in a week's time was inconsistent with his previous declarations against crossing his convent-threshold. Flavian calmly replied that the evidence before them was indeed sufficient, but that, in order to a fuller examination, the delay which he solicited should be granted to him. If on the 22nd of

November he did not appear, he should be deprived of his priesthood and abbacy.

The 22nd of November came; and two deacons were sent by the Council to summon Eutyches. They searched the bishop's house, they searched the cathedral; they found "neither him nor any one of his." Two others were despatched; they reported that they had not found him, but had learned that he was coming with a great body of soldiers, monks, and "apparitors" of the prætorian prefect. John the "advocate" confirmed this tidings, adding that they would not let Eutyches enter the Council-room, "unless we promise to restore him to them." Moreover, Magnus the "silentiary" or "lifeguard" was at the door, sent by the Emperor. The door was opened: Eutyches and Magnus entered. The latter produced a paper, in which the Emperor signified his intention to uphold the faith as proclaimed at Nicæa and Ephesus, and ordered that the "patrician Florentius, being a person well approved for right faith, should be present at the synod, since it was a question of faith." This was not to make him actually a member of the synod; and the implied permission to act as an assessor was not rested on any general lay right, but on the sovereign's exceptional command. The usual acclamations in honour of the Emperor were made as a matter of course; and some voices even exclaimed, in a strain substantially reproduced at the Hampton Court Conference, "To the high-priest Emperor!" Flavian then asked whether Eutyches himself wished Florentius to be present. Eutyches answered briefly, "Do what pleases God and your Holiness; I commend myself to you." Magnus was desired to fetch Florentius: he suggested that the Council had better indicate its own readiness to receive him by sending some cleric along with himself. Flavian answered with dignity, "If the Emperor had bidden us to send, we would have done so; but since he has not, do you go yourself alone." Florentius came: the accuser and defendant were directed to stand out in the midst; and Aetius, deacon and secretary, read the minutes. When the Formulary of Reunion was read in Cyril's *Lætentur Cæli* Eusebius with his usual impetuosity burst out, "By your feet, this man does *not* confess this! he never did agree to it; he has spoken in a contrary sense to any one whom he met!" Florentius suggested that "pope" (father) Eutyches should be asked whether he accepted it. Eusebius was not to be thus checked: "Let all the minutes be read through! They will prove my case. I ought

not to be prejudiced, if he now promises to sign some formulary ; I could appeal to bishops—Meliphthongus, Jovian, Julian—who know that he has taught amiss, let him deny it as he may !” Flavian, as before, tried to quiet Eusebius, but he cried out, “I am afraid of his intrigues. He is rich, I am poor. He threatens me with banishment ; he already depicts the Oasis as my destined abode.” Flavian began to lose patience : “If you say this a thousand times, we shall not prefer anything to the truth.” Again the lay assessor interposed in behalf of fair play and orderly conduct of business : “Let Eutyches be asked to state his belief.” Another protest from Eusebius, another assurance from Flavian, and Eusebius asked whether he admitted an union of two natures made in one Person, or not. “You hear, presbyter Eutyches,” said Flavian, “what your accuser says. Tell us whether you admit an union *from* two natures.” Eutyches answered, “Yes, *from* two natures.” Eusebius put a question which brought out the intended force of the phrase, union of two natures. “Do you admit two natures *after* the Incarnation, and do you say that Christ is co-essential with us according to the flesh, or not ?” “I did not come to dispute, but to state to your Holinesses what I hold. Let this paper, which expresses it, be read.” “Read it yourself.” “I cannot.” “Why not ? Is it yours, or another’s ? If it is yours, read it yourself.” Eutyches answered that it was his, but was equivalent to “the exposition of the fathers.” “What fathers ?” asked Flavian, waxing impatient at his incurable evasiveness. “Speak for yourself ; what need have you of a paper ?” He shuffled again, with a strange monastic puerility ; professing to adore the Holy Trinity, to confess the Son’s coming in flesh as having taken place from the flesh of the holy Virgin, and His having perfectly become man. Of course this was not accepted as explicit. Flavian asked whether Eutyches confessed the one Son to be co-essential with His Mother according to Manhood, as with His Father according to Godhead ? Eutyches deprecated this query. “I have said what I think of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit : ask me no more.” Flavian could not but persist : “Do you confess Christ to be *now* of two natures ?” Eutyches answered that he had never yet allowed himself to “speculate” about his God, the Lord of heaven and earth. He had never yet, he said, called “the Body of our Lord and God co-essential with *us*,” but he had admitted the Virgin-Mother to be co-essential with us, and that “our God” took flesh from her.

Basil pointed out the inference : if Christ's Mother was co-essential with us, so must Christ be according to the flesh. Eutyches yielded this point : "Since you now say so, I agree with you all." His difficulty, it appeared, was this : he was afraid that by calling Christ thus co-essential, he would be denying that Christ's body, though human—for that he acknowledged it to be—was "the body of God." That he should have felt such a difficulty proves the confusedness of his thought, and also the real affinity between his mind and that of the Apollinarians and the real gap which stretched between his point of view and Cyril's. He submitted to the archbishop's authority so far as to acknowledge this human co-essentiality in the Christ, saving always the full recognition of His divinity as "the Lord of heaven and earth, enthroned and reigning with the Father." But, when further asked by Florentius to acknowledge "our Lord, who was born of the Virgin," to be, *after* the Incarnation, "of two natures," he answered—and the words are memorable as representing the ground to which he held fast—"I confess that our Lord was of two natures before the Incarnation" (literally, the "union"); "but, after the Incarnation, I acknowledge one nature."

The first part of this sentence was literally an absurdity, for before the Incarnation or "union," it was impossible that our Lord should have been "of two natures," should have been anything but simply God. His humanity could not have been then in existence. The admission, then, was meaningless and valueless. But what was the significance of the second proposition? Certainly not what Cyril had explained himself to mean by the assertion of "one nature, but that an incarnate one," or "one nature of God the Word, even as incarnate." For Cyril understood that phrase to guard the singleness of the divine Self or *Ego* of the Word, both before and after His assumption of humanity. Eutyches clearly did not use "nature" in this sense, for his previous recognition of two "natures" before the union shows that he understood nature in the sense of "essence," or sphere of being. When, then, having asserted "two natures before the union," he asserted "only one nature after it," he could only mean to deny that Godhead and Manhood were united in the person of the Word as Incarnate,—of the Son of God as made Man. If this meant anything at all, it amounted to a retractation of the admission that Christ was of "one essence with men according to the flesh." For, if He had not, as man, a human nature, He was *not* of one essence

with men according to the flesh. It could not be said that he merely desired to restrict the word "nature" to the higher of two spheres of existence which our Lord occupied as Incarnate; there was, indeed, ample precedent for such a restrictive use, but in the first part of the crucial sentence Eutyches had spoken of two natures, one of which must mean "humanity." On the whole, then, it seemed that Eutyches's deliberate statement was inconsistent with any clear belief in the present and permanent humanity of our Lord. It was to be interpreted by the language which men of his party, and most probably he himself, were using when Theodoret wrote his "Dialogues"—language which flatly affirmed an absorption of the humanity by the Deity. Accordingly, the synod required him clearly to anathematize whatever was contrary to the dogmas which had been read, *i.e.* to both the Cyrilline letters inserted in the minutes. Eutyches showed signs of hesitation: "I have already told you that hitherto I have never said this," meaning, doubtless, the statement about the human co-essentiality; "but since your Holinesses affirm this, I say it, though I have not found it plainly taught in Scripture, and all the fathers did not teach it. But as for anathematizing whatever contradicts the writings in question, woe is me if I anathematize my fathers!" At this one or two of the bishops cried out, "Anathema to him!" As to what followed, there was afterwards much dispute. Flavian, after asking "what the accused person there present merited for refusing to accept the ruling of the synod, and persisting in his perverse misbelief" (here he speaks with a harshness unlike himself), is said to have given it as his judgment that if Eutyches would anathematize his own doctrine, and agree with the bishops, who were but following the traditions of the fathers, he would be worthy of pardon; but, if he persisted in his transgression, he would incur the penalties of the canons. Then, according to the minutes, Eutyches replied that he would *say* what was required of him, but would not anathematize.

What exactly happened at this crucial moment is not easy to tell. The "acts" of the Council, as they were taken down at the time by the secretaries and read at the Council of Ephesus in the next year, did not always tally with the evidence of various witnesses who at Ephesus gave their recollections of what had happened at Constantinople. The confusion had clearly been great. Longinus asserted that the bishops sitting at the back never knew, and therefore could not be expected to remember,

what had been going on in front. Seleucus thought that owing to the noise his own words were never put down at all. Aetius the secretary admitted that, acting under orders, he had not put on the minutes much that was said by bishops in the way of conversation and suggestion, and also that the statement of a single bishop, if he was understood to be expressing the mind of the rest, was entered in the form "the holy synod said." Thus we are not surprised to find some conflict of testimony both as to the exact questioner and as to the exact question put when the long examination came to its close. Constantine the monk, Eutyches's chief representative, maintained that Flavian was the questioner, and that he asked for an anathema from Eutyches on all who would not say "Two natures." The acts are silent about such a question at this point, and Basil professed himself unable to remember that anything like it was said in the final confusion, but hinted that Eusebius as accuser had on an earlier occasion made a demand in those terms. Florentius, however, remembered that when Flavian asked this question, Eutyches replied by referring to a "codex" of Athanasius. In the acts this appears as a reply to Florentius himself, and Eutyches refers to Cyril, as well as (mistakenly) to Athanasius, for "One nature after the union." The Council was growing more and more impatient: one bishop told Eutyches that if he would not confess one Only-begotten Son from two natures, he was denying either the Incarnation (literally, the "Economy") or the Divinity. Florentius saw that the bishops were urging Eutyches to yield, and exhorted him to acknowledge two natures after the union, in order to escape the impending sentence. Eutyches clung to his formula: he thought that if he gave it up, he would be giving up Athanasius. Basil tried to point out that he ought to add the word "incarnate" to "one nature," in order really to follow Athanasius (who was supposed, we again observe, to have written the paper containing the phrase); if he did not, he would be asserting a commixture or confusion. Seleucus suggested that the bishops should cause their several statements of faith to be read, and that Eutyches should be asked to assent to them: a cumbrous and impracticable expedient, which was not adopted. The scene ended in the abandonment of all further attempts on the constancy or obstinacy of the old man, against whom a strong resentment had been growing and gathering force. It was of no use to try to move him. He could not be won over. Some bishops remarked that, if he were to yield under

strong "pressure," it would not be a real act of "faith." "He will not agree with us: why attempt to persuade him?" and the sentence—which, according to Constantine's statement, had been drafted before Eutyches entered the assembly—was pronounced by Flavian, to the effect that, since Eutyches was thoroughly proved to be affected with the misbelief of Valentinus and of Apollinaris (the mention of Valentinus was a flourish of polemical exaggeration), and had resisted the persuasions and instructions of the synod, he was pronounced by the synod, through the authority of "Jesus Christ whom he had blasphemed"—an imitation of the Ephesian sentence—to be extraneous to all priestly office, to the communion of the bishops, and to the headship of his own monastery. All who henceforth should converse with him would be involved in excommunication. This sentence was signed by twenty-nine bishops, according to the Greek text of the signatures. If Basil's memory may be trusted, Eutyches had already, in reply to those who urged him to confess two natures, offered to do so if the fathers of Rome and Alexandria (Leo and Dioscorus) would require it of him. No one else appears to have heard or attended to this; but when the assembly was broken up, Eutyches said in a low voice to Florentius, "I appeal to the synods of Rome, of Egypt, and of Jerusalem."

Such was the trial and condemnation of Eutyches by the local synod of Constantinople in the November of 448. If one is struck, in reading the record, by the contrast of tone between such men as Flavian and Basil on the one hand and the fiery Eusebius on the other—if the care to observe due forms by an elaborate series of citations appears somewhat inconsistent with the disposition evinced in the imputation of Valentinianism to the unlearned old abbot—we must also see in Eutyches not merely a dogged and unintelligent fidelity to what he deemed an Athanasian formula, but also a consciousness of his own influential position and a facility of finesse and evasion which does not increase our sympathy or our respect. The question of interest, indeed, is whether Eutyches was substantially a heretic? Was he more than a mere bewildered formalist—a man who, at the close of life, found himself suddenly transferred from the position of a revered ascetic chief to that of a theological criminal, and who, amid the pitiless storm of ecclesiastical vituperation, lost his head and kept repeating obnoxious words without attaching to them any coherent sense? One would gladly think that this was so; yet his language at the Council

does not seem to be that of a person who *meant* to acknowledge a true humanity in the Incarnate, and who was only unfortunate in using terms which appeared to explain it away. And if Theodoret's "Eranistes" is at all a description of Eutyches, or of any person or persons whom Eutyches represented or upheld by his influence, one can hardly help imputing to him a practical negation of manhood as coexisting with Godhead in the Christ; and we know that he talked freely and eagerly on the subject, and did his utmost to disseminate a mode of speaking which he represented as the only safeguard against Nestorianism, although he must have known that it was not in accordance with the language of the Reunion—that it expressly avoided the use of terms which Cyril on that occasion had consented to adopt, and thereby set aside the safeguards which experience had proved necessary for the truth that "Very God" became, in a full sense, "Very Man." At the same time, historical fairness constrains us to acknowledge that it was somewhat stringent dealing for the "sojourning synod" of Constantinople to impose the acceptance of the "two natures" on peril of deposition and excommunication. It could only be by inference that the phrase could claim any full patristic authority, although it had been distinctly used by Gregory Nazianzen in an autobiographical poem, and Athanasius had as distinctly applied the term "nature" to Christ's manhood. And if it were said that the Homoousion had once been imposed when it was practically a novel term in Catholic language—when it had even been associated, in the former century, with conceptions grossly uncatholic—the answer might be, that the Council of Nicæa was one thing, and the little assembly which met in Flavian's "cabinet" was another. The justification of the latter consists in the fact that it had ascertained, to its own satisfaction, that Eutyches really fell short of such a recognition of Christ's humanity as was essential to soundness of Christian faith; that, although he was far enough from being a rationalist, and repeatedly disclaimed all "speculation" as to his Divine Redeemer's Person, and pleaded that Scripture, the supreme authority in matters of Christian dogma, did not constrain him to accept the formula proposed—yet, taking him with his antecedents, he must be found wanting in regard to the truth that Christ, the Incarnate Son, admitted to be personally one and Divine, took our humanity in its original completeness, and thereby occupied a lower or human sphere of being together with the higher or Divine sphere in which He had existed from

eternity. The principle, then, which Eutyches represented was a profoundly erroneous one; and it was this principle which was struck at when he was condemned. This does not amount to a vindication of all the language applied to Eutyches himself. It does vindicate the condemnation of "Eutychianism."

Flavian followed up the sentence by sending a priest named Theodosius, with some other clerics, to the monastery of the deposed abbot, to warn his monks that they must hold no intercourse with him, and that the property of the monastery must be kept in trust for the poor. Those who should disobey this mandate were to incur excommunication. The monks preferred this penalty to obedience. It is remarkable that neither Eutyches himself, nor any presbyter adhering to him, celebrated the Eucharist in the monastery during nearly nine months subsequent to the Council. A passive submission to the censure was thus far rendered; whereas one might have expected that, as deeming it unjust, they would have refused to deprive themselves of Communion at the bidding of those who pronounced it. Flavian is said to have encouraged a "multitude" to vilify Eutyches as "a heretic, a blasphemer, a Manichean," in the episcopal house and in the market-place; and we can well believe that he caused the sentence to be read in various churches and "martyries," and to be signed by members of the monastic communities. Such a course, Eutyches declared, had not been previously taken even against heretics; but then it might be answered that heresy on the part of an abbot was a new phenomenon. Flavian also sent information to the chief bishops of the East, and we can imagine the satisfaction with which Theodoret received it. He wrote to Flavian, panegyrising him as a "radiant luminary of the world," who had "turned night into mid-day:" he had brought comfort to those who were suffering affliction for the faith's sake, and, like a lighthouse in front of a harbour, had warned the unwary against rocks. Even the adversaries of the truth were admiring the courage which he had shown.

But Flavian did not write to Leo of Rome as speedily as would have been expedient. Eutyches was beforehand with him, and sent to Leo a dolorous complaint as to the treatment which he had received. At the age of seventy, he was in peril of being "cast out of the number of the orthodox, and of being shipwrecked at the close of life." He declared that he had recourse to Leo as a defender of religion, disclaimed all innovations in faith, repudiated Apollinarianism in detail, and subjoined a copy of the paper which

he had presented at the late synod and which Flavian had declined to receive. The Latin version of this letter, or rather fragment of a letter, exhibits, beside the Eutychian "libellus," a spurious passage ascribed to pope Julius, asserting "one nature" as involved in "one person." Eutyches also memorialised other leading bishops, doubtless in the same sense as in his letter to pope Leo: and he must have written with special confidence to Dioscorus of Alexandria.

Flavian's own letter to Leo is undated, but cannot be earlier than January, 449. He expressed his grief at the apostasy of Eutyches, but proceeded to describe the "sometime presbyter Eutyches" as having thrown off, at the late Council, the sheep's skin which had concealed his wolfishness. "He said that our Lord, since He is recognised as being of one person, ought not to be regarded as of two natures after the Incarnation; and that His flesh was not co-essential with us, as if taken from us; that the Virgin was co-essential with us, but the Lord had not taken from her a flesh *so* co-essential: and that His body was not the body of a man, but a human body." This was hardly ingenuous; for Eutyches had at last admitted the Lord's human co-essentiality. Flavian concluded by saying that he had sent therewith a copy of the minutes, and requesting that Leo would communicate the facts to all his subordinate bishops. There is not a word in the letter which implies reference to Leo's judgment as supreme, or which submits the recent sentence to his revision.

Before this letter arrived Leo had written to Flavian, on the 18th of February, 449. From his letter it appears that Theodosius had written to him at the same time as Eutyches, and probably in a sense favourable to the latter. Leo says, therefore, that he is surprised at not having heard from Flavian about the recent agitation at Constantinople—that, in fact, Flavian ought to have informed him. He has read Eutyches's letter: he understands that he had appealed against the sentence, and that the appeal had been ignored, so that Eutyches had had to publish protests at Constantinople; and under these circumstances he does not see why Eutyches should have been excommunicated. "Let me know," he says in effect, "what are the rights of this case: I must not give an *ex parte* opinion. Eutyches declares that he is ready to be corrected, if in any point he is proved to have erred. In such cases, great care should be taken to eschew wrangling, to preserve charity, and also to defend the truth." By the same

messenger he sent a letter to Theodosius, praising his solicitude for religion, but saying that he did not as yet clearly make out what had moved Flavian to excommunicate Eutyches. Nor did the charge drawn up by Eusebius go beyond generalities. He needed, therefore, precise information, in order that he might judge aright. "I have therefore expressed to Flavian my displeasure at his still keeping back, by silence, the facts of so grave a case, whereas he ought to have taken care to state them fully to us in the first instance. Now, at any rate, I hope he will do so." We must observe Leo's magisterial tone, and his eagerness to assume the seat of judgment as if two parties had appealed to his decision.

Flavian's reply was, in fact, his second letter to Leo, probably written in March. A right "dividing" of the word of truth was, he began, of supreme interest for bishops. He proceeded to state the error of Eutyches. He had said that there were two natures of Christ before the Incarnation, but that after it there existed but one: whereas, as Leo knew, the union did not confound the properties of the natures, but even in the union the properties of the two natures remained entire. Eutyches, moreover, while calling the Lord's body human, had denied that it was co-essential with us, or that it was of our substance or of human material organization. (This was again an unfair exaggeration of Eutyches's words.) Flavian then quoted from the acts of Ephesus a passage in Cyril's second letter to Nestorius, as decisive against Eutyches: "The natures which came together into a true union are different, but from them results one Christ and Son; yet not as though the difference of the natures had been taken away to make the union." He gave a brief account of the late trial. Leo ought to be informed, he added, that Eutyches had not only not repented, but had presented to the Emperor a petition full of arrogance and insolence, endeavouring to trample the canons underfoot. From Leo's letter Flavian had learned also that Eutyches had given him a false account of the facts. He had never made any formal appeal to Leo. This being the state of the case, Flavian requests Leo to "signify in writing his assent to the deposition which has been regularly pronounced;" such action on his part is all that is now needed: the excitement will be allayed, and the new Council which, according to common report, is likely to be held will be prevented, so that the churches of the whole world will be spared disturbance. One thing is quite clear on the face of this letter: the archbishop of Constantinople has no notion of pleading before

him of Rome as before a supreme judge. He tells Leo that he has been misinformed; he assumes his assent to the Constantinopolitan sentence when its bearings are rightly understood; he testifies his deep respect for the see of Rome, but he makes not the faintest recognition of any claim of Roman supremacy.

For some reason which we cannot now ascertain Flavian's first letter was delayed considerably beyond the natural time for its arrival. It had, at last, arrived, with the copy of the acts of the recent Council attached to it, when Leo acknowledged it on the 21st of May in a brief letter, indicating generally his agreement with Flavian's view, and his regret at the lapse of Eutyches from orthodoxy, or, as he says, from catholic tradition; and also promising a fuller answer—which promise, some weeks afterwards, he made good by writing his famous Tome. Flavian's second letter did not reach Rome until after the Tome was written, and was acknowledged by Leo on the 20th of June.

CHAPTER XLV.

THE PREPARATIONS FOR A NEW GENERAL COUNCIL.

EUTYCHES, as we have seen, was not in the least disposed to acquiesce in the sentence which had been pronounced by his archbishop at the head of a local synod. He added to his published protests a memorial to Theodosius, in which he requested him to summon a General Council. The Emperor, though a sentiment of irritation against Flavian had been produced in his mind, did not at once accede to this request. He tried to persuade Flavian to "waive the whole discussion,"—that is, to cancel his own judgment. Flavian had to meet these repeated imperial solicitations with a firm refusal. How could he, after what had happened, reinstate Eutyches on his simple profession of adherence to the Nicene faith? It was easy for the Emperor to urge that the creed was "sufficient:" but when its true interpretation was the very matter at stake, such an attempt to close the question was waste of words. Eutyches's importunities at last prevailed: as we have seen, when Flavian wrote his second letter to Leo, it was expected that a General Council would be convoked: and Theodosius, unquestionably in compliance with suggestions from Chrysaphius and Dioscorus as well as with the petition of the deposed archimandrite, wrote to Dioscorus on Wednesday in Easter week, March 30, 449, directing him to attend at Ephesus with ten metropolitans and as many bishops on the 1st of August, for the purpose of resolving doubts which had arisen in regard to the true meaning of the Catholic faith. In spite of the generality of the language so far, the aim of the Emperor was manifest in the express provision that Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhos, should not attend at Ephesus, unless he were specially invited by the bishops then and there assembled. Similar citations must have been addressed to the metropolitans of other Churches. Theodoret

obtained a copy of one, which his own metropolitan of Hierapolis had received. It filled him with the gravest anxiety. Not only did it seem to show that the storm which had troubled the Church was not abated; it was a clear indication of worse troubles yet to come. In writing on the subject to Irenæus, he pleads for the use of the term "Theotocos:" as if to say, "This is a time in which all of us Orientals ought to draw together, and give no occasion to the adversaries (the Eutychian party) to brand us as heretics on the subject of our Lord's Divine Person." To Domnus he also wrote, to this effect: "I had hoped that the Emperor had ceased to be angry with Flavian, and that we should hear no more of this scheme of a new Synod. One can expect no good from it, unless our merciful Lord should defeat the devices of the demons who cause agitation." He was afraid that the Council would confirm the Cyrilline articles; to which he would never give his assent. He urged Domnus to select for his companion-bishops, when he went to the Council, men who were of the same mind, and to take with him clerics who were not likely to be entrapped or intimidated.

Soon after the summons had gone forth, Eutyches renewed his former complaint as to the untrustworthiness of the records of the synod of Constantinople, and petitioned for an inquiry into them. Accordingly, on the 8th of April the tribune Macedonius, acting under instructions from Theodosius, repaired to the baptistery of the church of St. Sophia, where were assembled twenty-seven or twenty-eight bishops, with Florentius. Certain monks, it appeared, were deputed by Eutyches to speak for him. Objections were made to the reception of a charge in the absence of the responsible accuser; but they were overruled on the ground of the Emperor's express wish. Thereupon three monks, Constantine, Eleusinius, and Constantius, were introduced as representatives of Eutyches. Macedonius then announced that the Emperor had ordered the bishops to be put on their oath as to whether the impugned minutes were correct. Basil objected; it was unheard of that a bishop should be put on his oath and Christ had expressly forbidden swearing. No one, "standing as if before the altar, having the fear of God before his eyes, and keeping his own conscience clear before God, could suppress anything that he held in his memory." Flavian's notaries, five in number, of whom Aetius was the spokesman, were next called in. Aetius began by asking why they were summoned. "To produce the minutes,"

was the answer. "Are we accused of anything?" asked Aetius. Florentius rebuked him for evasiveness. Aetius still persisted in trying to gain time: it was, he said, a matter of peril for himself and his colleagues; let them know who charged them with misreporting. "You are not accused," said Florentius. The order to produce the acts was repeated. Flavian then spoke to his notaries: "You know quite well what you wrote when employed by the Council: if you wrote what was true, say so precisely; if you misreported anything, let it be confessed as before the tribunal of Christ." Florentius remarked that the archbishop, at any rate, was clear of fraud. Aetius asked whether the bishops would order them to produce the acts; Seleucus answered that the archbishop had ordered them to do so. Both sides then produced their copies of the minutes. "We learn," said Aetius, "that Eutyches says he has inspected the minutes and found matter for a charge of tampering. Had he any original text of the minutes, or only a copy?" It appeared that he had only a copy. "In whose hand?" asked Aetius; "and who supplied it?" The "patrician" ordered the reading to proceed. The minutes of three sittings were read. In the third Eutyches, according to the notaries' text, had in conversation with John the "advocate" professed himself ready to subscribe *in toto* the expositions of the holy fathers at Nicæa and Ephesus, but had added, "If they have stumbled or erred in any of their phraseology, I neither accept nor reject it, but 'search the Scriptures' only, as being more sure than the exposition of the fathers." Constantine questioned this, and wanted to make it appear that Eutyches's appeal to Scripture applied not to the definitions of the Councils but only to matters in which "the holy fathers spoke diversely." Some wrangling ensued, and several bishops urged that Eutyches's monks ought not to admit this and reject that arbitrarily, among the sayings attributed to him. John and Andrew were examined: John's words, as uttered at the Council, were read out. John observed that he could not—that no one could—repeat the words of another with literal exactness; but he had made a memorandum at the time, which he now produced and which was read. With regard to the point raised by Constantine, the report of John, as taken down at the Council, was fully borne out by his own memorandum; but a discrepancy was detected on a still graver point, for the denial by Eutyches of the "co-essentiality of Christ's flesh with *ours*" was in the report, but not in the memorandum. What had John to say on this point?

He could not explain it. But the discrepancy was serious: "It is not a *little* alteration." John was ready to swear that the denial in question had been really uttered by Eutyches: it was made to John himself, apart; that was why he had not noted it in his memorandum. Andrew gave his own account of the matter: some words, he said, had been spoken which he had not heard. This sort of discussion went on for some time; at last Florentius announced that what had passed would be laid before "the Emperor's grace," while Aetius claimed to have shown that the notaries had thus far proved themselves blameless. Liberatus sums up the transaction by saying that "although some (of the bishops) for the time were favourable to Eutyches, no fraud could be discovered; but this only was done—minutes were made out on the question of falsification on the part of the notaries before Martial, the Master of the Offices."

Eutyches presented another petition to the Emperor, asking that Magnus the "silentary," who had been sent to conduct him "for safety's sake" before the Council, should be heard as to what he knew on the subject of the drawing-up of the sentence; *i.e.* whether it had not, in fact, been framed before he had been examined—he afterwards said, "long before." Martial was thereupon commissioned to hear what Magnus had to say. It came to this, that he had been "frequently sent" by the Emperor to signify to Flavian his desire that Florentius should be present at the Council which was to be held in the Episcopal palace. Flavian "put off the matter," saying that there was no need to trouble Florentius, since Eutyches's condemnation was already drawn up in consequence of his disregard of the second citation; and, in fact, the sentence thus drafted was shown to Magnus before the final session. Constantine, Eutyches's deputy, asked that Macedonius the tribune might also depose as to what he had heard from Asterius, presbyter and notary. "Although this point," said Martial, "is not mentioned in the petition, the tribune may, if he so pleases, state what he has ascertained." Macedonius then affirmed that, after the conclusion of the recent inquiry as to the falsification of the records, Asterius came up to him, conjured him to listen to what he had to say, and then accused the other notaries of having falsified certain points in the record without his consent. This statement also was taken down.

According to Liberatus, it was after the inquiry as to the falsification that Theodosius required of Flavian a written profession

of his belief, signed with his own hand. "It was strange enough," says Tillemont, "that this prince should thus make himself a judge of the faith of his archbishop ; but Flavian made no objection on that score, because he was not ashamed of the Gospel, and knew that nothing was so befitting a bishop as to be ready to give every one a reason of his faith and his hope." In these words Tillemont summarises the opening sentence of the profession of faith which Flavian drew up and presented to the Emperor. It resembles very nearly his previous declaration before his synod. In it he affirms that he "always follows the Divine Scriptures, and the expositions of the holy fathers who met at Nicæa, and at Constantinople, and at Ephesus : " thus intimating his belief that the Council of 381 sanctioned a recension of the Nicene Creed, and also disclaiming all sympathy for Nestorius or his school. Then he asserts his entire belief in "one Lord Jesus Christ, begotten of God the Father without beginning before all ages according to His Godhead, but in the last days, Himself the Same, for us and for our salvation (born) of the Virgin Mary according to His Manhood ; perfect God and the same (person) perfect man by the assumption of a rational soul and a body ; co-essential with the Father according to His Godhead, and, being the Same, co-essential with His Mother according to His Manhood ; for while acknowledging the Christ *in* two natures after His taking of flesh from the Holy Virgin and His becoming man, yet in one hypostasis and in one person do we confess one Christ, one Son, one Lord. And because there is one and the same Lord Jesus Christ from both, we do not refuse to say that the nature of God the Word is one, yet was incarnate and became man : and those who proclaim that there are two Sons, or two hypostases, or two persons, and do not preach one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God, we anathematize and judge to be alien from the Church : and first of all we anathematize the impious Nestorius and those who think with him or speak with him : and let all such fall from the adoption which is promised to those who believe aright." To this formulary Flavian added, with his signature, the words, "Lord Christ" (or, as Liberatus's version says, "Lord Jesus Christ"), "help us, O God," and further, "This I have written with my own hand, for your Majesty's assurance, and for the confusion of those who calumniate our good and simple behaviour in Christ" (1 Peter iii. 16).

This confession would have a peculiar interest, if its real text anticipated the final resolution of the Council of Chalcedon in

favour of the adoption of the phrase "in two natures." Part of it was taken from the formulary of Reunion, and yet, like Flavian's speech in his Council, it did not follow that formulary in asserting the co-essentiality of Christ according to manhood "with *us*," but, less pointedly, "with His Mother"—which may make us suspect that the present reading, "in two natures," was substituted by a later hand for "of two natures." Some of its words were adopted with amplifications into the Definition of Faith put forth by the Council of Chalcedon.

We must now go on with the events which immediately preceded the assembling of the proposed Council at Ephesus. It was, we have seen, on the 30th of March that Theodosius sent his first letter to Dioscorus. In the latter part of April he received from Count Chæreas the report of the recent proceedings against Ibas at Edessa. On the 14th of May he took the extraordinary step of inviting, or rather summoning, by a stretch of "Cæsarean" prerogative, a very zealous anti-Nestorian abbot, named Barsumas, to repair to Ephesus, and to take his seat in the Council as representative of the abbots of the East. The letter recites that Barsumas has gone through great labour in the cause of the orthodox faith against Nestorianism: which Tillemont translates, as it were, into the language of fact by saying, "because, not contented with having, like other monks, revolted against the 'Oriental' bishops, he had come to cabal against them at the Court." On the very next day Theodosius wrote again to Dioscorus to inform him of this summons, and to request him to welcome Barsumas and provide for his taking his place in the synod. A third letter, which has no date, begins by referring to the previous prohibition of Theodoret's attendance. "We abhor him," says the Emperor, "because he attempted to write in opposition to the dogmatic statements of Cyril of blessed memory. But since it is possible that Nestorianizers may do their utmost to get him admitted into the Council, we signify to your Piety and to the whole Council, that on account not of Theodoret only, but of all who are concerned with the Council, we assign to you the chief authority and the presidency, knowing that Juvenal and Thalassius and every one who is equally fervent in zeal for orthodoxy will be of one mind with you." Theodosius—as keen for Dioscorus now as he had been keen against Cyril in 430—added that any persons minded to add to, or take from, the Nicene and Ephesian expositions were to have no freedom of speech in the Council, but to be subjected to the judgment of Dioscorus. He also

ordered Elpidius, a member of his consistory, and Eulogius, secretary of state, to see to the maintenance of good order in the Council, and to prevent those who had sat in judgment on Eutyches from sitting again as judges at Ephesus; and he directed Proclus, the proconsul of "Asia," to assist Elpidius and Eulogius in their duty. He showed his animus against Flavian in a letter to the Council, in which he represented Flavian as having wilfully and obstinately stirred up the present contest, in defiance of remonstrances from himself, and added that, as he deemed it unsafe to have such questions raised without the authority of a Council, he had summoned the bishops to meet, that on learning what had taken place at Constantinople they might expel from the church all supporters of Nestorian blasphemy and provide for the safe maintenance of the orthodox faith. A singular exhibition of imperial impartiality, to dictate a foregone conclusion to a "General Synod!"

Meantime how did Leo of Rome regard the situation? As we have seen, he had received Flavian's first statement of the case, and being thereby convinced that Eutyches *had* fallen into error he had written to Flavian a brief letter dated May 21st, from which it would be clear to the archbishop of Constantinople that he would, at any rate, have Rome on his side. "We will not permit you," said the strong-willed Pope, "amid your resistance to a bad and foolish error, to be any longer disturbed by the attacks of the opposite party." It was easy for Leo to write thus; but he was ere long to learn how little he could do towards protecting Flavian against Dioscorus, when backed by the Emperor, or, afterwards, in setting right a wrong which that Emperor upheld.

He had, however, to take some steps in regard to the approaching Council. He professed to regard the time allowed for preparation as extremely short; he had received his notice, or invitation, on May 13th, and the council was to open on the 1st of August. He had no intention of going himself to Ephesus: there was no precedent for such a journey on the part of a bishop of Rome; and public affairs were in such a state that his people would have strenuously opposed his departure. He must, therefore, appear by deputy: and he resolved to send as legates Julius, bishop of Puteoli, Renatus, a presbyter, and Hilarus, a deacon. And on the 13th of June he signed a number of letters, one of which, addressed to Flavian, became famous through all Christian ages as the doctrinal "Tome of St. Leo."

The Tome ranks as the 28th of Leo's letters. He begins by

disparaging the "aged man" whose mind had not yet grasped the purport of the very baptismal creed, which implied the real assumption of human nature by the Co-eternal Son. His temporal birth could not, Leo urges, in any way impair His eternal Sonship: all its effect was "spent" on the work of man's restoration. For how could man "overcome the author of sin and death, unless the Son of God would assume and appropriate our nature—he whom neither sin could taint nor death detain in its keeping?" Then follows a string of texts selected as indicating the reality of our Lord's human birth: and so we come to the more properly dogmatic portion of the tome, beginning with the words, "Without prejudice, then (*salva igitur*), to the properties of each nature and substance, and while both met in one Person, humiliation has been accepted by majesty, weakness by power, mortality by eternity; and, to pay the debt attaching to our condition, the inviolable nature was united to the passible: so that—a consequence which provided us with a fitting remedy—one and the same Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, might be able to die on account of the one element, and not be able on account of the other. Thus *in* the entire and perfect nature of real man, real God was born." He guards here against the notion that our Lord assumed any trace of sin, which was not part of our original nature: "He assumed the form of a servant without the stain of sin, enhancing what was human, not diminishing what was Divine: for that 'emptying' whereby the Invisible made Himself visible, and the Creator and Lord of all things willed to be one among mortals, was a condescension of pity, not a failure of power. He who, abiding in the form of God, made man, the same was made man in the form of a servant. Thus each nature retains its own propriety without defect." He adds that since the devil had exulted in man's ruin as giving him a companion in misery, and as showing that God had been constrained by justice to alter His own sentence in regard to the creature whom He had so highly honoured, there was need of a secret Divine plan, whereby that God whose gracious intention could not be frustrated should "carry out the original design of His mercy by a more hidden mystery." Leo goes on to emphasize, like Proclus, the antitheses of the Incarnation: the Infinite One willed to be grasped, the Lord of all put on the form of a servant, the impassible God did not disdain to become passible man. "He who is true God, the Same is true man; and there is no deceit in this union, where the lowliness of man and the loftiness of

Godhead confront each other. As God is not changed by the compassion, so man is not consumed by the dignity"—i.e. is not absorbed in the majesty of the Godhead. "Each form fulfils its own function in concert with the other: the Word working what belongs to the Word, the flesh what belongs to the flesh. One of these glitters with miracles, the other bows down under injuries." Again the personal oneness is affirmed: "it must," says Leo, "be often said, He is One and the Same, truly Son of God, and truly Son of man." The attributes of Godhead and Manhood are then distinguished; but with entire recognition of the fact that they both belong to one Person. "To hunger, thirst, be weary, sleep, is clearly human. But to feed five thousand men with five loaves, to give the Samaritan woman living water, to walk the sea with unsinking feet, to rebuke the storm and abate the surging waters, this is undoubtedly Divine. . . . So, it is not of the same nature to say, 'I and the Father are one,' and to say, 'The Father is greater than I.' From what is ours He has that Manhood which is inferior to the Father: from the Father He has the Divinity which is equal to the Father." Leo then passes on to what is called theologically the *antidosis* or interchange of Divine and human properties, not in themselves but purely as predicable of the one Christ under either His human or Divine titles, according to the texts, "The Son of Man is in heaven," and, "They would not have crucified the Lord of glory." He mentions the confession of St. Peter, explaining it as a recognition at once of humanity and divinity; he refers to the events of the great forty days, as illustrating the co-existence of humanity with divinity in the one Son of God; he cites 1 John iv. 3, in the remarkable old reading (originally, doubtless, a gloss), "He who dissolves Jesus:" he argues that to be doubtful as to Christ's human flesh is to be doubtful about His Passion, and therefore about His redemptive work. "In Christ Jesus true humanity and true divinity" must be believed together. Leo next gives utterance to surprise at the absence of any explicit censure of Eutyches's words, "The Lord was from two natures before the union, but after the union I confess (but) one:" to say that He was "of two natures before the Incarnation" was impious; to deny two natures in the Incarnate was not less forbidden. Lest Eutyches should deem a statement harmless which Flavian had not condemned, Flavian should be careful not to omit exacting a recantation of it, if, by God's mercy, Eutyches were to be brought round. To judge from

the records, he had begun to amend, and admit what before he had not admitted ; but when he refused to anathematize the impious doctrine, it was clear that he deserved condemnation. However, if even now, though late, he acknowledged his error and was sorry for it, or if he would condemn orally *and* in writing whatever he had said amiss, some compassion towards a man who had been set right would not be blameable ; “for our Lord, the true and good Shepherd, who came not to destroy but to save men’s lives, wills us to be imitators of His own lovingkindness.” Leo adds that he sends legates in order to the due settlement of the whole affair.

The theological value of this document was recognised by its world-wide reception during its author’s lifetime : his successors Gelasius and Gregory anathematized those who did not receive it : and it became usual to read it during Advent at Rome, and in other Western churches. “I think,” says Tillemont, “that nothing has rendered St. Leo so celebrated, or has contributed so greatly towards drawing to him the veneration of the whole Church.” At the same time it would be unreasonable to regard the Tome as a complete and final statement. At Chalcedon some minds peculiarly sensitive as to any seeming approaches to Nestorianism held some of its expressions to attribute a distinct personality to Christ’s Manhood ; but this was over-literal, and what is said, for instance, about the action of both “forms” or natures, means the action of the One Person through one or the other. Still it may be not unnaturally felt that justice is scarcely done to the co-operation of both natures in Christ’s miracles, such as must be recognised in His atoning self-sacrifice, and in the joint action of His divine love and His human sympathy. If, however, it is further objected that Leo is content to collocate, without correlating, the divine and human elements, we must remember that our materials for the latter process are but scanty ; that theological systematisers have often gone wrong in premature attempts at a formal harmony of the two aspects of a complex truth ; and in particular, that such a correlation as Kenoticist theories suppose, according to which the Son of God, on becoming incarnate, did in His *divine* sphere of being temporarily surrender certain divine “attributes” or perfections, would seriously impair our estimate not only of His work of redemption but even of the very nature of God.

Leo wrote also to Theodosius, assuming, with the conventional diplomacy of the age, that the purpose of the Emperor in summoning the new synod of Ephesus was that the “inexperienced old

man" might gain a clear knowledge of that truth which was now so dark to him; nor did he omit to mention the written promise of Eutyches to correct whatever he, Leo, should disapprove: the teaching of the Catholic Church on the mystery of the Lord's Incarnation was, he added, "more fully" set forth in the letter sent to Flavian. Of another letter, to Pulcheria, there were apparently two drafts made, a longer and a shorter. In the latter, which was sent to Constantinople and translated into Greek, he observes that it is of no use to call Christ "man," if one does not own Him to be of the seed of Adam, Abraham, and David; that the question at issue is vital; and that if Eutyches is obstinate, no one can remit the sentence already pronounced—a sort of *caveat* against the possible action of Dioscorus, but canonically untenable in view of a coming General Council, which, as such, would be able to review the proceedings of a local synod. He professes his reliance on Pulcheria's "thoroughly pure faith," and "the holy earnestness with which she has always supported Catholic teaching." The longer epistle ascribes Eutyches's error rather to inexperience than to subtlety. Ignorance often comes to a serious fall; the "incautious simplicity" of Eutyches has been misled by a spirit of falsehood, so that he "*thinks* that he is making a more reverential estimate of the majesty of the Son of God by denying to Him the reality of our nature:" he does not believe that what was born of the Virgin was our substance—here, observe, it is *assumed* that Eutyches only professed to accept the human co-essentiality, and did not really believe it. The Pope restates his position, that to call Christ true and perfect man is not enough; He must be owned to be of the same substance with the first Adam. He explains his sending of legates to represent him; he refers to the Creed of "the twelve Apostles" as embodying the truth which Eutyches had failed to apprehend. "If he had chosen to accept that Creed in its entirety, and with a simple mind, he would never have deviated from the decrees of the most sacred Nicene Council." He again contemplates the possibility of Eutyches's conversion; in which case, if he makes a written recantation, he is not to be denied restoration to his dignity. To Faustus and other orthodox abbots of Constantinople Leo also wrote, but in a harsher strain as regards Eutyches: we hear no more of incaution and inexperience, but of blasphemy and impiety. To the bishops assembled at the Second Council of Ephesus he wrote on the same date (the 13th of June), professing to appreciate

the Emperor's regard for the divine teaching as shown by his desire to employ the authority of the apostolic see and therein virtually of Peter himself, and describing Eutyches as having shown by his ignorance of the purport of St. Peter's confession that in him "the hoary hairs of old age were not adorned by any ripeness of mind." He assumes that the Council's first business is to condemn the pestilent error of Eutyches; adding, that if, after this is done, Eutyches should fully condemn his heretical opinions, his restoration might be taken into consideration.

A short letter to Julian of Cos explains that Leo was for a long time unaware of what the Catholics were offended with in Eutyches—until he received a copy of the acts of Constantinople. A longer letter was dated on the same day, but despatched somewhat later; it was meant to give Julian Leo's view of the doctrinal issue. What good was it for that thoughtless old man to denounce the orthodox as "Nestorians"? Nestorius went wrong in one direction; Eutyches had gone as wrong in another. His idea of our Lord's humanity was docetic; whereas our redemption requires a true humanity in our Redeemer. Leo almost reproduces some of his own words—the words of the Tome—as to the personal union of two natures in Christ. He excludes all idea of "conversion into flesh" or "into soul," or of conversion of flesh into the Word. "Both Word and flesh remain in the One" (he speaks here, as sometimes in the Tome, of "the Word," where we should expect "Divinity," as one of the two "natures"); "the One is in both," not divided by diversity, not confounded by mixture: not one from the Father, another from the mother: but the Same, in one way from the Father, in another from the mother. The uniqueness of the nativity, its miraculous character, "did not make the Lord's flesh of a different substance from ours," even though His humanity had no corrupt element, though there was nothing "adverse" in His flesh, and His bodily senses were operative without any accompanying "law of sin." When Leo adds, "True man was united to true God," the context forbids anything like a Nestorian interpretation, as if he had regarded Christ as an individual human person. He concludes by saying that the subject might call for a lengthy letter, but Julian's learning made it unnecessary in his case; and the recent letter to Flavian might suffice to confirm the faith not only of bishops but even of laymen as well.

A week later, Leo wrote a letter to Theodosius to this effect:

“I cannot attend the Council on the day which your Grace has fixed, but I send my deputies.” On the same day he dated a fourth letter to Flavian. It contrasts curiously with the conventional tone in which, when writing to Theodosius, Pulcheria, Julian, or the future Council, he had assumed that the Emperor’s motive was excellent and laudable. Now, when he can speak his mind, he tells Flavian that the matter did not need to be dealt with by a synod. Again, on the 23rd of July, Leo writes to Flavian, referring to a letter which had given him some fuller information, but which is not now extant. It seems that Flavian had indicated his apprehension as to the result of the synod. Things were not likely to go so smoothly as Leo had hoped. But he urges Flavian not to be “terrified by adversaries: what was so glorious as to fight for the faith of the Gospel against the enemies of the Nativity and of the Cross of Christ?” He again refers to the Tome, expresses his confidence that he and Flavian are of one mind, and advises him to “use the remedy of patience in curing the insanity of the inexperienced, so that, through fatherly rebukes, those who, while old in years, are children in mind, may learn to obey their superiors.”

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE "LATROCINIUM."

THE Roman legates, as Tillemont expresses it, "went straight to Ephesus without passing by Constantinople, because they meant to go thither after the Council." On their way they stopped at Delos, where Renatus, one of their number, died. The other two on reaching Ephesus were heartily welcomed by Flavian. To him, amid his thickening anxieties and forebodings of disaster, they represented the most effectual help and sympathy that he could count upon at this crisis. He entertained them at breakfast, and showed them all possible attention. Perhaps it would have been more judicious on their part to have accepted the hospitality of Stephen, bishop of Ephesus. This prelate had thrown open his house to Eusebius of Dorylæum and to the clerics in attendance on Flavian, and "communicated with them;" and when violently abused by Elpidius and Eulogius, at the head of some 300 Euty-chianizers, for having thus "received the enemies of the Emperor" (a charge which of itself showed, as Tillemont puts it, what was to be expected from this Council), he answered that he was acting as a "hospicer," was not prejudging any question, and "could not treat persons who came to him in communion with the Church as excommunicate."

The Council consisted of about 130 bishops; Dioscorus was president, and next to him the chief prelates were Domnus, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Eustathius of Berytus, Eusebius of Ancyra, Basil of Seleucia in Isauria. Eutyches and Barsumas were present, accompanied by a number of their monks; and Dioscorus had taken care to strengthen himself by the attendance of a number of "parabolani" from Alexandria, men of the same stamp as those rough zealots

whose passions had been enlisted by Cyril in the cause of the Church against the Jews and against Hypatia.

The sittings of the Council did not actually commence until Monday the 8th of August. The place was that same church of St. Mary where the Œcumenical Council of 431 had assembled. Dioscorus took his seat on an elevated throne, with a footstool in front of it ; and next to him, apparently, were Julius of Puteoli (whom the Greek acts appear to confound with Julian of Cos), Juvenal, Domnus, and then, set below these as being himself subject to examination or indeed open to accusation, Flavian of Constantinople. One almost wonders that he was allowed any place among the members of the synod : Dioscorus might have been expected to insist that he should sit apart in the centre. Hilarus was placed below even Barsumas ; his position as a Roman legate being, rather significantly, less regarded than his clerical standing as a mere deacon. The proceedings began in due form with the reading of the imperial letter of summons, as it had been addressed to Dioscorus. Julius and Hilarus testified that Leo had received a similar letter ; Hilarus described it as containing an entreaty for Leo's presence, and added that "the pope of the holy see" doubted not that the Council would do all that was required by the interests of the faith and by reverence for St. Peter (for Leo lost no opportunity of introducing that topic), and that he had charged his delegates with a letter to the Council : "order it to be received." "Let it be received," said Dioscorus. But his notary John struck in, doubtless under secret instructions : "There was another divine" (imperial) "letter addressed to archbishop Dioscorus," which could be laid before the synod. Juvenal was so complacent, or so obsequious, as to move that *this* letter be read. After it had been read, no one moved anything as to Leo's letter (it must be remembered that it was not the "Tome"), which Dioscorus was afterwards accused of wilfully keeping back from the Council, although he had "sworn seven times" that he would have it read. Anyhow, the letter was not read and Leo's intentions were frustrated. The president asked count Elpidius and the tribune Eulogius to speak : Elpidius made a speech, in which he said that the Emperor had brought the present question before the bishops as "fathers and judges," desiring to obtain from them its solution. He thought proper to give the Council some religious advice as to their duty to Christ, and to warn any who might

he disposed "by artful language to bring matter of faith into doubt," that they would incur the condemnation of God and of the Emperor. A proposal to draw up an abstract statement of doctrine was defeated by Dioscorus: the business was, he said, to consider whether the proceedings at the synod of Constantinople were consistent with the decrees of the fathers; therefore let them examine those decrees, as passed at Nicæa and Ephesus, two synods which yet were concerned with one faith. Their decrees were above discussion; to recast them was to set at nought "the grace of that Spirit who had presided in those synods."

It was next resolved to call on Eutyches to state his own case. He began by commending himself to the Holy Trinity and to the justice of the Council and by calling on the members to bear witness to his faith: let them cause his memorial and his profession of faith to be read. This was done. The memorial addressed to the Council began with a thanksgiving to the all-holy God for that day, on which true religion had regained confidence. For himself, he had from childhood resolved to spend his whole life in quietness (the term had a special reference to monastic seclusion), but he had not been allowed to carry out this resolve. Enemies had put him in peril, because he would not deviate from the Nicene faith. Then he set down the creed in its Nicene form—ignoring, as utterly as Cyril had done, the so-called "Constantinopolitan" recension. In this faith, he proceeded, he had been baptized and "sealed" (*i.e.* confirmed); in it he prayed to die. It had been ratified by the Council of Ephesus, with a prohibition against any alteration of its wording; of this decree he had a copy, which Cyril himself had sent him. He proceeded to anathematize Manes, Valentinus, Apollinaris, Nestorius, and all heretics up to Simon Magus, besides those who said that Christ's flesh had descended from heaven. Two prelates thereupon asked him to say whence Christ's flesh had in fact been derived, whether the Word had really assumed flesh. He would not answer, and the subject was ordered to drop. The memorial went on to complain of Flavian and of the other bishops who had at the time been staying at Constantinople, for obliging him to meet the indefinite charges of Eusebius, and for ultimately condemning him in spite of his professed adherence to the Councils, of his appeal to a future Council, and of the consideration due to "the grey hairs of one who had grown old in strife with heresy and in the confession of true religion." He then described the subsequent

events from his own point of view, and concluded a well-worded plea by entreating the synod to take account of the calumnies got up against him, and to inflict due censure on those who had been the authors of the mischief. Flavian quietly said, "This man has Eusebius as his accuser; order Eusebius to attend." Count Elpidius interrupted: "The accuser has fulfilled his task and ought not to have a rehearing; let the acts of the trial at Constantinople be read." Dioscorus moved that they should be read; Juvenal and others assented. Julius said he was content, if the Pope's letter might first be read, and Hilarus demanded that it should be read. However, Dioscorus ruled that the acts should be read first, then the letter of the bishop of Rome. The acts, accordingly, were begun; and it is thus that we gain our knowledge of them from their insertion within the acts of this synod of Ephesus, just as we know the acts of Ephesus by their insertion within those of Chalcedon.

The reading of the acts was interrupted at many points: *e.g.* when Eusebius's indictment was read, containing a profession of adhesion to the Council of Ephesus and to the "expositions of Cyril," the bishops cried out, "Dioscorus and Cyril have one faith!" (a proposition far from accurate)—whereupon Julius declared that the Apostolic see similarly assented to Cyril's teaching. After the *Lætentur Cœli* had been read, Eustathius of Berytus claimed that it should be interpreted by Cyril's subsequent letters to Acacius, Valerian, and Succensus, in which the phrase, "One nature of the Word, a nature incarnate," was defended as being Athanasian—though this, as we have seen, was an error. When the reader came to Basil's speech, in which the phrase "*in two natures*" was upheld and explained, some one (Basil at Chalcedon could not remember who) rushed forward exclaiming, "That phrase has upset the Church," and the Egyptian bishops and the monks who followed Barsumas cried out, "Cut him in two who says 'two natures'!" Basil was thoroughly frightened; he might well expect the worst when he was furiously denounced as a Nestorian. Dioscorus sarcastically observed, "Keep silence a little; let us hear other blasphemies. Why are we to blame Nestorius only? There are many Nestoriuses." His notary John then volunteered a remark: "From what has been read we observe that those who said these things *did* put forth another creed beside that which was put forth at Nicæa and confirmed here." The reading went on, interrupted for a short time

by a remark from Ætherichus, bishop of Smyrna, to the effect that he was misreported as having given assent to those who had spoken before him at Constantinople. At last the reader came to the report of Eusebius's question to Eutyches, whether he admitted "two natures after the Incarnation," and "the co-essentiality of Christ with *us* according to the flesh." Forthwith a tumult arose which was one of the most characteristic incidents of this ill-omened assembly. "Away with Eusebius! burn him! burn him alive! tear him in two! As he has divided, let him be divided!" The bishops who poured forth these wild outcries thought that Eusebius had required Eutyches to admit Nestorianism; for, to their ears, the "two natures" imported nothing less. Dioscorus did his best to fan the flame. "Is this statement, 'two natures after the Incarnation,' tolerable to you?" His supporters cried out, "Anathema to him that makes it!" He resumed: "Since I have need both of your voices and of your hands, if any one cannot shout, let him hold up his hand." Again the shout arose, "Anathema to him that says 'two'!" When Eutyches's declaration of his belief was read, as it had been uttered before the synod of Constantinople, Dioscorus and his adherents accepted it as orthodox: in fact, it was colourless on the question at issue: but when they came to his further words, admitting that our Lord was of two natures before the incarnation, but confessing only one after it, the president and the majority again assented, and so committed themselves to his formula. The report of Basil's words, imputing the notion of "mixture" to the deniers of two natures, caused the terrified Basil to say that he did not know he had used those words: he believed he had said, "If you, Eutyches, say 'of two natures before the Incarnation,' but assert 'one nature after it,' you will be *thought* to assert a confusion and mixture; but if you will add 'incarnate,' you will speak like the fathers."

The proceedings of the Council of Constantinople having been read through, Eutyches procured the further reading of the acts of the subsequent inquiry. This having been done, the unfortunate Basil again attempted to minimise his concern in the proceedings against Eutyches, or to reinstate himself in the approbation of Dioscorus, by professing not only that he abhorred all deviation from Nicene and Ephesian standards, but that he retracted his own words in favour of two natures, and "adored the one nature of the Godhead of the Only-begotten who became incarnate." At Chalcedon he gave some explanation of his own weakness: "there

rushed into the church armed soldiers, and the monks with Barsumas and the parabolani and a great crowd beside stood up ;” in short, he was terrorised by those whom the president had at his beck—though, by his own account, he did not with his own lips retract his statement, but asked by the mouth of another bishop that it might be “corrected.” Seleucus made a similar retraction ; whereupon Eutyches remarked that this proved the previous falsification of the acts, and referred to a statement of Magnus the Silentiary, which statement Flavian characterized as false. “Prove it,” said Dioscorus. “I have been debarred from speaking,” replied Flavian. Dioscorus, who on this occasion spoke calmly and decorously, said that he had *not* been forbidden to speak ; and asked Eusebius of Ancyra whether this was not true. “God knows,” said Eusebius to Flavian, “we wish you to speak.” Dioscorus asked a similar question of Stephen, then of all the prelates. “The holy synod said, ‘We have not prohibited him.’” Then Flavian declared that the minutes of the second session of Constantinople contained no falsification—that the acts were examined in presence of the bishops of Cæsarea and Ancyra, and of Magnus, and nothing of the sort was discovered. Nothing in those acts could touch him. He had never thought or held, and never would hold, otherwise than was right.

Dioscorus then asked the bishops to speak their minds as to Eutyches ; and one hundred and thirteen in succession declared him to be orthodox, and voted for his restoration to his dignity. Among these was Domnus of Antioch, who said that the sentence against Eutyches had been sent to him from Constantinople, and he had signed it ; but now, as Eutyches professed his adhesion to the decrees of Nicæa and Ephesus, he agreed that he should be reinstated in presbyteral rank and in the government of “the pious brethren who were placed under his rule.” Basil of Seleucia made a similar statement. Of course this was a pitiable self-condemnation ; for Eutyches had given just the same guarantee, whatever it was worth, at his trial. When all had spoken—for, as Tillemont phrases it, “Dioscorus willed that each individually should take part in this abomination”—Barsumas was also permitted to add his vote by an interpreter, to the effect that “like a child he followed his own fathers, and testified to the orthodox faith of the holy archimandrite Eutyches, rejoicing that the bishops had restored to him the degree of priesthood and the government of his monastery.” Dioscorus then said, “I confirm

the votes of this whole oecumenical synod in the case of the pious archimandrite Eutyches, and bring in my own judgment, that he should hold his place in the rank of the presbyterate and preside over his own monastery, as he did of old." A petition from Narses, priest and monk, and thirty-four other members of the same monastery, was then read, complaining of the interdict under which it had lain, and begging the synod to cancel Flavian's unjust sentence against them and to punish him for having inflicted it. Dioscorus questioned them on their faith. Did they hold, as to the Saviour's coming in the flesh, with Athanasius, Cyril, Gregory, and all orthodox bishops? Did they adhere to Eutyches's own written statement of faith? Did they anathematize those who thought otherwise? They gave, of course, satisfactory answers, by the mouth of the deacon Eleusinius. It was resolved that the sentence in favour of Eutyches should include them in its scope.

The synod then ordered the doctrinal documents of the former Council of Ephesus to be read. When the reader commenced the Ephesian decree forbidding the composition or presentation of any "faith" other than the Nicene, Onesiphorus of Iconium said to Marinianus of Synnada and Epiphanius of Perga, who were sitting beside him, "This canon is being read for no other purpose than to procure the deposition of bishop Flavian." "God forbid!" said Epiphanius: "if any one is to be the object of indignation, it will be Eusebius; no one can be so mad as to attempt anything against Flavian." But it was soon proved, says Tillemont, that Onesiphorus was right. When the reading ceased, Dioscorus recapitulated the prohibitory decree, but unwarrantably extended its meaning, as if it had forbidden all doctrinal "inquiry" beyond the terms of the Nicene Creed—an extension which was not only unfair but suicidal, for it would have condemned the terms "hypostatic union" and "Theotocos;" and, quite as unjustifiably, he omitted the clause, as to "presenting no other creed to converts," which so limited its scope as to make it quite inapplicable to anything which had been done by Flavian in his synod. He called on the prelates to signify their opinions in writing, as to whether any one who should "inquire" further would or would not "subject himself to the condemnation of the fathers." Thalassius then declared that he abhorred those who thought contrary to the Nicene faith: which was not a direct answer to the question. Four other bishops said in effect the same. Then Julius, with

Roman brevity, pronounced, "the Apostolic see holds this." Four other prelates expressed their strict adhesion to this faith. Hilarus declared that the Apostolic see taught and venerated the Nicene and Ephesian theology, and reminded the Council of the Roman letter addressed to it, "which, if you order it to be read, you will find to harmonize with the truth." Another and yet another bishop protested his intention of abiding by the same faith. Then Dioscorus summoned his secretaries: they brought him a paper which was read, but which appears in the acts as his speech. It was to this effect: after a preamble giving his own account of the Ephesian rule as to the Creed, it proceeded to say that "Flavian and Eusebius, who have been bishops of Constantinople and Dorylæum, have been the occasion of scandal and disturbance to the churches, and to the orthodox people everywhere; it is clear, therefore, that they have made themselves liable to the penalties prescribed by the fathers; and accordingly we, affirming what the fathers decreed, have judged the said Flavian and Eusebius to be alien from all priestly and episcopal dignity." Each of the bishops was then requested to declare and put on record his own judgment, and it was at the same time intimated that the proceedings of the day would be made known to the Emperor. Flavian laconically uttered his protest: "I disown you," *i.e.* "I demur to you, Dioscorus, as an incompetent judge." Hilarus was equally succinct; he pronounced the one Latin word, *Contradicitur*. If he said more, as Theodoret's language in one of his letters might imply, it was not recorded; nor is any similar protest ascribed to his companion Julius of Puteoli. Onesiphorus of Iconium, with his friends, rose up, in order to remonstrate; he clasped the knees of Dioscorus, exclaiming, "Do not, by the feet of your Piety! He has done nothing worthy of deposition. But if he is worthy of deposition," he added, in the incoherency of agitation, "let him be deposed." "You have presbyters of your own," said the bishop of Synnada: "the lord bishop ought not to be deposed on account of a presbyter." "If my tongue were to be cut out," said Dioscorus, "I can say no other words." Basil begged him not to suppress the opinion of the whole world—a sample of hyperbole which was likely enough to exasperate the president, who rose up from his throne, stood conspicuous on its footstool, and fiercely asked whether they were getting up a sedition against his authority; adding, as the witnesses afterwards deposed, "Where are the Counts?" Elpidius and Eulogius hastened to his side. At their

bidding the proconsul entered, with a large body of soldiers carrying sticks and swords, and also brandishing chains which might be used as instruments of coercion. The terror thus excited was materially enhanced by the violence of the monks who surrounded Barsumas, and of the "parabolani" who had accompanied Dioscorus to Ephesus and who now apparently entered at his call. Bishops who attempted to leave the church found exit impossible; those who tried to escape observation were pointed at by the president, as he stood up and warned them that whoever refused to sign the sentence would have to reckon with *him*. Sheer physical terror, combined with the effect of menaces of deposition or exile, extorted signatures from many reluctant bishops. They declared afterwards that they had been made to put their names to a blank paper, and this after some of them had been detained in the church until the evening.

Such was the account given at Chalcedon, rather more than two years later, by some who had assented in these circumstances to the sentence against Flavian and Eusebius, and who naturally desired to represent themselves as having acted under practical compulsion. It contrasts remarkably with the representation given in the minutes. There we find, after the protest of Hilarus, a string of speeches by bishops, expressing their assent to the judgment framed by Dioscorus. A hundred prelates, followed by Barsumas, are described as thus verbally assenting. Juvenal begins: he says that Flavian and Eusebius have shown themselves alien from the priesthood and the episcopal rank, in that they have attempted to add to, or to take away from, the Nicene faith confirmed at Ephesus. Domnus follows in briefer terms; Thalassius next finds the two prelates guilty of acting contrary to the decisions of the fathers as to the faith; Eusebius of Ancyra says he "always likes what is kindly, but he consents because the interests of religion have moved the fathers" (*i.e.* the other bishops) "to pass this sentence;" Stephen of Ephesus, probably anxious to atone for his courtesies to Eusebius and to Flavian's clerics, declares that the sentence is just. Other bishops follow, whose speeches are preserved only in the Latin version of the acts—the Greek from this point onwards gives nothing beyond the names of the bishops voting—*e.g.* Diogenes of Cyzicus, who was opposed to Eutyches, says that he consents; the unhappy Basil says, as if addressing his brethren, "I consent to all that your blessednesses have decreed." Photius of Tyre consents; Marinianus of Synnada,

who had joined with Onesiphorus in his remonstrance, is made to say that he entirely follows what has been ordained by the synod, "which is of higher authority than my littleness;" and Nunechius, who had sat by him and concurred with him, also consents. Some few bishops had already, in the process of Eutyches's acquittal, given vent to severe words against Flavian's synod and its sentence: and a bitter attitude becomes now still more marked. Uranius of Himeria says that those who have tampered, like Flavian, with the Nicene and Ephesian rulings, "deserve even to be put to the sword;" Pancratius of Libyas says that by "the crash of Flavian's episcopate" the world has been set free from scandal; Leontius of Magnesia says that Flavian and Eusebius have to attribute their destruction to their own blasphemy; Theopemptus of Cabasa says that Flavian has desired to establish Nestorianism; John of Hephæstus says the like, and brands the two bishops with giving occasion to pagans and Jews to mock at the faith as if it were still unsettled; Barsumas says, "Following your Holinesses, I will condemn Flavian and Eusebius, who have been condemned by you." After this in the (Latin) acts comes a longer series, not of speeches but simply of signatures, in number a hundred and twenty-nine, not including Barsumas and two priests who sign as proxies for their absent bishops. It is observable that Onesiphorus of Iconium, who certainly *did* sign under terror, does not appear in either list; while his companions appear in both. The speeches ascribed to them invite suspicion. Nor can we well suppose that, amid the excitement and confusion which, according to these witnesses and to Basil of Seleucia, followed on the remonstrances of Onesiphorus and the rest, all these speeches could have been uttered before the signatures began. The order of names is not identical in the two series; but towards the end of each, a number of Egyptian bishops come together. In the list of signatures, one bishop (Uranius) appears as signing for himself, though further on a priest signs for him at his request. Two bishops appear as signing by the hands of other bishops, expressly on the ground that they "do not know letters." Julius of Puteoli certainly did not sign, and seems to have escaped.

The most tragical incident in the scene of terrorism was a brutal onslaught made by Barsumas and his savagely fanatical monks upon Flavian. He was thrown down, and kicked, and otherwise maltreated; this must be taken as an unquestionable fact, although Theophanes, the Byzantine chronicler—who wrote three and a half

centuries later than the events we are recording—may be wrong in saying that it took place "even before his deposition." At the Council of Chalcedon, Diogenes, bishop of Cyzicus, declared that Barsumas had stood over Flavian after he had been knocked down, and cried out, "Stab him!" If Dioscorus did not personally take part, as was afterwards alleged, in these outrages, his two deacons, Harpocraton and Peter—the latter of whom, surnamed Mongus, became afterwards Monophysite bishop of Alexandria—are not improbably said to have been forward in the attack on Flavian. Liberatus says that Flavian and Eusebius were both committed to prison; and the short Latin "*Breviculus*" of the history of the Eutychians (otherwise known as the "*Gesta de nomine Acacii*") tells us that Flavian was taken thence to Epipa, a city in Lydia. There he died of the cruel treatment which he had received: as Liberatus expresses it, "in consequence of the pain of the blows he passed away to the Lord." If Theophanes can be credited, his death took place on the third day after his deposition: but this is hardly consistent with the above-mentioned authorities, nor with the appeal which he managed to get conveyed to Leo; and his death was not generally known for several months. Tillemont—always vigilant in pointing a moral for the rebuke of secular-minded clergy—says of him, that "he might easily have enjoyed on earth all the satisfaction that can come from great riches and the highest dignity, if he had chosen to cheat his conscience by the specious pretext of tranquillity and peace: but he preferred to exasperate an avaricious minister, instead of enriching him with what belonged to the poor; and he feared not to declare himself the defender of a truth which was odious to the court and was attacked by monks and by bishops powerful in this world."

Dioscorus did his utmost, by threats and persuasions, to induce the legate Hilarus to attend another meeting of the Council, and there to assent to the condemnation of Flavian. Hilarus himself wrote afterwards to Pulcheria, that no scourges or torments would have extorted from him such an assent, but that he had succeeded in escaping from Ephesus, and by an unfrequented course had made his way safely back to Rome. Of the bishop of Puteoli we only know that his report of the proceedings did in some way reach Leo.

It is here that the Syriac "acts," translated and edited by Abbé Martin, begin, and fill up a gap; their compiler coolly omits the first session with all the proceedings against Flavian, as if his

readers could have as little interest as himself in so small a matter as the condemnation of a Greek archbishop; or, possibly, because he thought it expedient to suppress what had given such scandal to Christendom. But from this point he gives full details. Dioscorus at the later sessions took up, one after another, the cases of all the leading bishops of the party opposed to him. It mattered nothing that some of them, such as Theodoret and Ibas, were absent, and that the ordinary rules of justice forbade any one to be condemned before he was heard in his own defence. With regard to Ibas, Photius and his colleagues described their own action; a memorial to Chæreas from the Edessenes was read; his official report, and a letter from him to the Master of the Offices, followed; and at last sentence was pronounced against Ibas as having uttered impieties and blasphemies, and the letter to Maris called forth such outcries as "Let Ibas be burned! Satan is more pious than Ibas!"—although a number of the bishops who thus succumbed to the absolutism of Dioscorus had no knowledge whatever of the case of the bishop of Edessa. Ibas's nephew Daniel, bishop of Carrhæ, was next attacked on the ground of immorality and sacrilege. Domnus, it was said, had tried to shield him by refusing to hear his accusers; Eustathius affirmed that he had resigned his see when he found that deposition would otherwise be imminent; Photius said that such a man "ought not to go up to the altar." Uranius was strong on the same side; Dioscorus adhered to their opinion; and sentence of deposition was pronounced. A like measure was meted out to Irenæus as a Nestorian and a digamist, to Aquilinus of Byblos—whom Photius oddly described as "more irascible than Irenæus"—and to Ibas's first cousin, Sophronius of Tella. Sabinian, who had been canonically appointed to the see of Perrha, after it had been resigned by that Athanasius who had imposed on Cyril, was deprived without a hearing, and Athanasius was reinstated in his see.

Naturally the great theologian of the Oriental party was not to escape the remorseless vengeance of Dioscorus. A Syrian priest of Antioch presented a "libellus" against Theodoret, the character of which may be estimated by a few extracts. Theodoret had composed a new creed; he and Domnus had forced the complainant to sign it, and then made him say that he had done so voluntarily. Theodoret had said, "Don't meddle with Scripture; rather translate Plato, Aristotle, and the medical writers"—a spiteful hit at Theodoret's renown as a scholar. This "libellus"

rose higher and higher in wild vehemence: it recalled the slaughter of Agag and of the Baal-prophets; it urged the Council to "burn, burn, burn, Nestorians." Passages from Theodoret's anti-Cyrrilline writings were then read. Dioscorus, in a violent speech, denounced Theodoret as having dragged to ruin numberless souls, and as meriting not only deposition but excommunication. Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil, Florentius, Eustathius, spoke in the same sense; and the "holy council" exclaimed, "So say we all: drive out the heretic." Theodoret was condemned, by his own account, at the simple dictation of "the president," which was obeyed by men who had agreed with him whom now they abandoned. The crisis, he says, exhibited some of them as traitors, others as cowards. In another letter, he speaks bitterly of those who as readers, or deacons, or presbyters, or bishops, had warmly commended his preaching at Antioch,—had come up at the end of his sermons to "kiss his head, his breast, his hands, or even to embrace his knees," and had called his doctrine "apostolical," yet had now condemned it with anathema. They used to call him "a luminary, not only of the Orient, but of the whole world;" and now, as far as their power extended, he was not to be allowed so much as a loaf of bread!

Domnus had humiliated himself enough, it might be thought, by yielding to the storm, signing the sentence against Flavian, and acquiescing in that against Theodoret. But this was not deemed to be enough. The "Pope of Alexandria" determined to have the satisfaction of setting his foot, as it were, on the throne of Antioch as well as on that of Constantinople. Accordingly, three days after the deposition of Flavian—that is, as Abbé Martin reckons, on the 23rd of August—when the unhappy bishop of Antioch was (not unnaturally) ill and unable to appear in the Council but had signified his assent to the recent depositions, a "libellus" was received accusing him (among other things) of having built a house for Theodoret, and having called him "father:" it was also alleged that he had opposed the proceedings against Irenæus; that, when addressing catechumens in Holy Week, he had insisted on the difference of the Two Natures; that he had persecuted Alexander, bishop-elect of Antaradus, for having recourse to Cyril; that he himself had been promoted by pagan influence, consecrated at 4 p.m. without any Eucharist, and had made three persons bishops by mere letters without imposition of hands. A letter of his to Flavian, complaining of Dioscorus,

produced a violent outcry: "He who slanders Dioscorus blasphemes God!" A correspondence between Dioscorus and Domnus was next read. Dioscorus had complained bitterly of Theodoret, affirmed that the orthodox in the Orient were scandalised, and exhorted Domnus to provide the Church of Tyre with a good bishop in succession to Irenæus. Domnus replied that the Oriental bishops were true to the Nicene Creed, and that he had used as tests of orthodoxy Cyril's letter to John and Athanasius's to Epictetus: to which Dioscorus had replied, "You are walking in crooked paths; I again beg you to silence Nestorianizers." Domnus in his rejoinder again upheld the Reunion, and praised "the blessed Cyril," professed agreement with fourteen great episcopal authorities, but remonstrated against the naked assertion that "God died," which some Egyptian monks had uttered even during "the sacrifice;" deprecated a revival of the quarrel about Cyril's articles, which he described as "obscuring the question," meaning that they were open to misconstruction. But even such mild criticism was an offence in Egyptian eyes. Dioscorus pronounced him to be deposed; Juvenal, Thalassius, Stephen (in a violent speech), Eusebius, Diogenes, Basil, Photius, and others, followed suit. He was apparently sent into exile: he was named along with Flavian, Eusebius, and Theodoret, in a law promulgated by Theodosius after the Council; and it is to be observed that his deposition was the only act of that Council which was not reversed. "The weakness which he had shown," says Tillemont, "well deserved this deposition:" he probably never asked for restoration, "as it is certain that he made no such request at the Council of Chalcedon: God, perhaps, in mercy permitted him to remain unrestored, in order to relieve him of an office for which he was not competent, and to give him opportunity to make amends by penitence in solitude for the faults which he had committed." The unhappy man is said to have retired after a time into the wilderness of Judæa, and to have resumed the ascetic life under the oversight of the holy recluse Euthymius. If he buried himself in this penitential solitude, we can understand why, at the Council of Chalcedon, a pension for his support was made chargeable on the Church revenues of Antioch, at the request of Maximus, who had been consecrated as his successor.

Such was the ill-fated Council of 449, which, in combination with that of Ariminum, brought so deep a discredit on the very name of an ecclesiastical synod. But the moral drawn from these

two cases by the African bishop Facundus of Hermiane, in the sixth century, points out the cause of their common disgrace: "Nowhere has a Council been under constraint without subscribing to falsehood." Constantius by his agents domineered over the one; Dioscorus in person, supported by the government, was yet more tyrannous over the other. These two Councils, in short, fell, because they were not morally free. Their example tells nothing against synodical action where its legitimate conditions are observed. What it does tell against is the confidence in mere numbers as a guarantee of fidelity and resolution.

This miserable assembly is known in Church history by a name which Leo, in effect, attached to its proceedings nearly two years later, when, writing to Pulcheria, he speaks of "that Ephesian trial—no, not trial, but brigandage." The phrase took, and remained in the Church's memory with the tenacity of an epigram at a crisis: the Council which called itself the Second of Ephesus has been known throughout all time as that of the *Latrocinium*.

CHAPTER XLVII.

THE INTERVAL BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

IT is supposed by Tillemont that Dioscorus hastened with Eutyches to Constantinople, after he had finished his work at Ephesus. He “wished not only to enjoy in the midst of the court the fruits and the plaudits of his victory, but to render that victory more complete and more assured by procuring its confirmation at the hands of the Emperor and by ordaining a new bishop at Constantinople.”

Doubtless we must see the hand of Dioscorus in the law to which allusion has already been made, and by which Theodosius, after reciting the previous sanction of the Nicene and Ephesian doctrine, affirmed that Flavian and Eusebius, by following the “pernicious suggestions” of Nestorius, had involved the Churches in schism; that, in consequence, he had ordered a second Council to meet at Ephesus; that this assembly had reaffirmed the faith of Nicæa, and had deposed from the episcopate not only Flavian and Eusebius, but also Domnus, Theodoret, and others; that he therefore approved and confirmed the decrees of this recent synod, and ordered that no one who held the heresy of Nestorius *and* Flavian should be ordained a bishop; that any such person who had already, by some malignant and premature action, been so ordained, should be deposed; that no one should retain, read, or copy the writings of Nestorius, or Porphyry, or Theodoret, but should, if he possessed them, deliver them up to be burned in public. Observe the combination of the first and third names with that of the great antichristian writer of the third century.

One can fancy the exultation with which the archbishop of Alexandria and the now reinstated archimandrite would read this law, which Tillemont calls “the most injurious to the honour of Theodosius that can be imagined.” They would feel that now, at length, they had made sure work; not only had Flavian been

deposed by a solemn œcumenical decree, but there was reason to believe that he had actually passed out of the world; no doubt they would talk freely of a divine judgment as having confirmed the Church's sentence. The next business was to provide for the vacant see. The Emperor, we are told, in the first instance consulted the clergy of Constantinople, reserving to himself the choice of the most approved of all the candidates. But this produced a demonstration on the part of those ecclesiastics who had been loyally attached to Flavian; and they were supported by a large number of the laity, whose feelings were expressed in loud acclamations. There were, on the other hand, others who belonged to the Eutychianizing party; and Theodosius, wishing to avoid a dissension which might be dangerous, took the singular course of entrusting the election to those foreign ecclesiastics who happened to be at that time in Constantinople. The choice fell on Anatolius, a priest of Alexandria, who had been employed by Dioscorus as his agent at Constantinople for Alexandrian Church affairs. He was accordingly consecrated by Dioscorus and other bishops then at Constantinople. It was said that Eutyches took part in the service on this occasion, and that Anatolius said to him, "You sanctify any place you tread upon!"

Leo wrote to Flavian on the 11th of August, not knowing what had happened: "Your silence increases my anxiety." "I have written to you often, and it is long since I heard from you; I sent Basil" (a Greek deacon) "back to you at your own wish, and now I send this short letter by the hands of the 'honourable man' Euppsychius, and beg you to write with all speed and inform me as to the conclusion of the affair. I trust that your news may relieve my anxiety." This was the substance of a letter which, of course, Flavian never received. Leo was, as he says in it thrice over, very anxious; but he had no expectation of hearing such news as at last came to him. The reality must have exceeded his worst fears. We are at no loss to picture the interview at the Lateran between him and Hilarus, who at last arrived at Rome and narrated the tragedy of Ephesus but could give no information as to the fate of Flavian. Thereupon Leo set to work to write to the Eastern Emperor and his sister. In October he addressed to Theodosius a letter which we possess both in a first draft with a Greek version, and in a fuller form. It begins in lofty terms as to his own confidence, derived from St. Peter, that he would have power to vindicate the truth; he proceeds to say, in plain words,

that the late Council had "injured the faith, and wounded all Churches." The reason was evident: those who had assembled had "not acted with a pure conscience, nor given a righteous judgment." Some had been excluded who had a right to be present at the Council; others with no right were brought in, who signed the condemnation of Flavian under false representations from Dioscorus. Writing in behalf of the bishops who were with him (for he had evidently summoned many Italian prelates to a synod), Leo entreated Theodosius, "by the undivided Trinity and the holy angels of Christ," to let the whole case stand over for the adjudication of a truly General Council. The confession of a perfect and abiding humanity in Christ, together with that of His true Deity, was the object for which martyrs had suffered. Let the fuller Council, he requested, be held in Italy; this was the petition of the Western bishops: let the Eastern bishops come hither. It would be consonant to the written appeal of Flavian, and to the "Nicene canon" (or canons). Leo is here alluding to the Sardican canons which provided for a certain kind of appeal to Julius, bishop of Rome, and for a consequent rehearing. He must have been aware of the case of Apiarius, in which the Roman claim of "Nicene canons" for the appellate authority of the Roman bishop had been proved on the best evidence to have no warrant from the genuine text of the canons of Nicæa. Yet he chose to shut his eyes to the facts, and continued, as we shall see further on, to make that claim, although in terms more general than had been used by his predecessors; for he founded on the "canons" not any special right for his own see, but the propriety of holding a general Council in the West, for which the terms of the Sardican canons give no authority. He wrote again, a longer and synodical letter, on the 13th of October, to this effect: "Your letter, inviting me to the Council, led me to hope that all would go well: the cause was so simple and so well defended; and my legates were so well instructed, that if Dioscorus had allowed either my letter to Flavian, or that to the Council, to be read at the Council, the truth would have been too manifest to admit of further discussion. But private feuds were prosecuted under pretence of religion; and an eye-witness has assured me of the facts. The large number of bishops assembled would have been beneficial for consultation and decision, *if* he who chose to preside had shown the moderation befitting a bishop; *if* all had, as was customary, been allowed to speak freely, instead of being coerced

into setting captive hands to the sentence which he dictated." The rest of the letter is but an expansion of the request in the previous letter for a general synod in Italy. Another letter of the same date was sent to Pulcheria. Leo tells her that his legates had been prevented by the calamitous issue of the Council from presenting his letter to her; he therefore sends a fresh copy of it, and entreats her aid for the undoing of the injury which the recent Council has done to Christian faith. His legates had protested that what was being done through force and terror could not prejudice the Church's teaching or the Apostles' Creed, and that they could not depart from his own doctrinal statement, set forth in his letter to the synod, which letter was not allowed to be read. He sends her a copy of his letter or "petition" to her brother, in which he has asserted that Flavian continued to be in the communion of the Westerns and has asked for a new Council to be held in Italy; and he concludes by again bespeaking the exertion of her influence, which has ever been used to relieve the troubles of the Church. He addressed another letter (one cannot read it without some touch of mournfulness) to one who by this time, or rather, probably, for weeks before this time, had passed out of the reach of friend or enemy; he exhorted Flavian to "endure for the time what would redound to his everlasting glory," and assured him that he was "omitting nothing that had to be done in the common cause." Two days later, on the 15th of October, he wrote a synodical letter to the clergy, the laymen in high office, and the faithful people, of Constantinople. In it he describes the signatures to the condemnation of Flavian as "extorted from unwilling bishops by the bishop of Alexandria, who alone claimed the whole power for his own self-will." He exhorts them to stand firm in adherence to Flavian: whosoever during Flavian's life shall dare to usurp his see will never enjoy his (Leo's) communion: let them regard their own bishop as representing Him for whom he feared not to endure all that was inflicted upon him. There were at Constantinople some fifteen archimandrites who were steadfastly anti-Eutychian, and to the first four of them, Faustus, Martin, Peter, and Emmanuel, Leo addressed a few lines of exhortation, citing the text, Gal. i. 9. "Flavian had been allowed by the Lord to endure trial, that He might render His well-proved bishop more illustrious by the merit of perseverance." This letter also ran in the names of "Leo and the sacred synod which had met in the city of Rome."

At last, after these letters had been despatched, Anatolius wrote to Leo a letter announcing his election, and explaining why his consecration had been hastened; a fragment of it is still extant. Leo might seem to be aware by now of the tragical end of Flavian's troubles; for he represents himself long afterwards, in a letter of March, 453, not as having felt indignation at the intrusion into a living man's see, but as having had reasonable "suspicions" on account of the circumstances of the new bishop's promotion. And yet subsequent letters will show that (possibly in consequence of some fresh rumours) Flavian was believed at Rome, in February of the next year, to be still alive. But after his death had, at last, been ascertained beyond all doubt at Rome, Leo still remembered that Anatolius had been consecrated by Eutychianizers, and expected him to be "not unlike his consecrators;" neither he nor they, in their letters to Leo, had said a word to indicate a repudiation of Eutychian errors. Leo refrained from writing in reply: he did not disown Anatolius as bishop of Constantinople, but he suspended intercourse with him until he should be satisfied as to his orthodoxy. Anatolius appears to have consecrated Maximus, who took possession of the see of Antioch, Domnus being regarded as deposed, and also, in effect, as having tacitly resigned all claims to his see. The act was in Leo's eyes uncanonical. It might be natural to identify Maximus the bishop of Antioch with Maximus the abbot of Antioch, whose zeal against Nestorianism was so prominent in Cyril's later years, if the bishop's subsequent attitude did not seem to exclude this.

That there was deep resentment in the Orient, as well as in Pontus and "Asia," against Dioscorus and his adherents, is most certain; but Liberatus probably exaggerates when he speaks of an open breach of communion. This step would have been too dangerous. Theodoret speaks of the bishops who disapproved the proceedings at Ephesus as still externally in communion with those who had taken part in them; Maximus seems to have encountered no resistance; Eusebius of Dorylæum had to see his church usurped by an intruder; Sabinian had to give place to Athanasius. One Nonnus was enthroned at Edessa, and Theodoret wrote to console Ibas, saying, with an evident allusion to Flavian's fate, "Let us allow the murderers to retain their honour, and luxury, and precedence, and unhappy glory; only let *us* hold fast to the doctrines of the Gospel!" But he also wrote a much more important letter, the most famous that he ever did write, to Pope Leo, after having

obtained a copy of his letter to Flavian, which was proof enough of his hostility to Eutychianism. New hopes had dawned on Theodoret: he might enlist the Western Church's sympathy and influence in behalf of himself and other persecuted bishops of the East; he accordingly wrote to the bishop of Rome. "If Paul," he begins, "betook himself to Peter for a solution of doubts raised at Antioch, much more may such a one as I am ask of your apostolic throne a remedy for the diseases of the Church." This version of the mission of Paul and Barnabas in Acts xv. 2 would hardly bear examination. Theodoret emphasizes the "primacy" or precedence of the Roman see, as based in part on the dignity of the old imperial city (on which he dwells in rhetorical style), but mainly on the traditional "faith of the Romans" (Rom. i. 8), and on the possession of the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul. "*This* is the consummation of all your privileges"—*this*, the double treasure at the Vatican and on the Ostian road: but of any divinely ordained supremacy over the whole Church, he says nothing. He proceeds to extol Leo's own orthodoxy as illustrated by his zeal against Manicheism, and by what he had written on the Incarnation, setting forth the oneness of the eternal Son, who, being Divine and as such impassible, assumed a nature like to ours in all points, save in its immunity from sin. Nothing can be more explicit than Theodoret's identification of the suffering Christ with the eternal Only-begotten. He proceeds to summarise the enormities of "that most just prelate of Alexandria;" he complains, as he had done in other letters, that bishops were condemned without that fair hearing which the civil courts grant to homicides and "tomb-breakers;" he recurs to Dioscorus's injustice to himself, dating from the day when he anathematized him in church; he then, in what is, autobiographically, the most interesting part of the letter, dwells on his own episcopal labours, whereby he had converted more than a thousand Marcionites, and many Arians and Eunomians, and amid which he had often been pelted by heretics. "I await the decision of your apostolic see as to whether I deserve condemnation." He begs Leo to send for him to Rome, and to examine his writings: let him not overlook the wrongs done to his grey hairs, after all the work he has done! Then comes a passage which reads very obsequiously. "Above all things, I request to be informed by you whether I ought to acquiesce in this unjust deposition, or not: if you bid me abide by the sentence, I will abide by it and trouble no man further, but

await the impartial judgment of our God and Saviour." He could well afford to use this language; he knew how Leo would regard his case, and he implies that, in any event, he can rely on a divine acquittal. He protests his own disinterestedness: all that he cares about is the scandal caused to some ill-informed persons who, looking at the dignity of his deponents, inferred that he must be a heretic. He adds that during his whole episcopate he has never procured a house, a field, an obolus, or a tomb! He wrote about the same time—the end of the year 449—to Renatus the legate, whose death was not then known to him, and in writing this letter he asked Renatus to persuade Leo to "use his apostolic authority, and bid me fly to your Council"—evidently as representing the West, so that he was not appealing to Leo alone. He also sent to Florentius, a Western bishop, a letter which was probably a circular to other Western bishops; and he requested the patrician Anatolius to obtain Theodosius's leave for him to plead in the West before its hierarchy. Leo's answer to Theodoret is not extant, but we know that he did acknowledge the bishop of Cyrrhos to be orthodox, and pronounced him to be worthy of restoration to his see.

In the hope that, if he himself had failed to impress the Eastern sovereign, an appeal from the Western Emperor might succeed, Leo took the opportunity of Valentinian III.'s arrival at Rome on the 21st of February, 450, to make a further move. He had already, some five years before, proved his own ascendancy over the "feeble and dissolute" prince who nominally reigned over the West, by obtaining from him (and perhaps suggesting in the actual form of its wording) the edict already described in connexion with his own arbitrary conduct towards Hilary of Arles. He now met the Emperor with his mother, Galla Placidia, and his wife, Licinia Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius II., when they came to worship at St. Peter's on the 22nd of February, the festival of the "Chair of Peter." In that imperial group, the chief personage was a poor creature who at thirty had not emerged from vicious indolence. His mother was an interesting and pathetic figure: the widow of a gallant Gothic prince and of a vulgar but vigorous co-emperor, she had failed as ruler of the West, and yet more conspicuously as a mother; her success had been the adornment of Ravenna. Eudoxia had been married twelve years; she loved her unworthy husband, and her disgust at an enforced marriage with his successor was to bring on Rome in after years

the shame of a Vandal capture. The imperial personages, after visiting the tomb of the apostle, were accosted by Leo and a large number of bishops from various Italian provinces, who joined with him in requesting them to interpose their influence with a view to the removal of the scandal caused by the proceedings at Ephesus. They consented; and we can easily trace Leo's hand in the group of letters despatched to Constantinople. Valentinian writes to his "father" Theodosius, that he is bound to secure for the bishop of Rome, "on whom antiquity has conferred the primacy among bishops," an opportunity of "judging about the faith and the bishops," in accordance with Flavian's express appeal. Let him therefore be permitted, at a General Council held in Italy, to examine the whole case from the beginning, and to pronounce such a sentence as religion might require. This is a tolerably clear indication of Leo's own aims and intentions—a summary, in fact, of his programme. Placidia tells her nephew that Leo had adjured her by St. Peter, "while tears mingled with his words," to intercede with him; she also speaks as if Flavian could still be restored to his rights, refers to the precedent of Roman legates' attendance at the Nicene synod, uses the familiar Roman language about St. Peter having established the head bishopric at Rome, and asks that the controversy may be settled in accordance with Leo's "definitive formula." Valentinian's Empress wrote a shorter letter, which need not detain us, to her father. Placidia wrote also specially to her niece Pulcheria in terms very like those of her letter to Theodosius, asking her to co-operate with a view to the cancelling of the proceedings of that "tumultuary and most wretched Council." It is observable that while Valentinian and his wife ask for a new Council, Placidia just indicates this point in one of her letters, and in the other speaks merely of referring the case to the apostolic see.

A few weeks later, Leo wrote again to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, referring with pleasure to the proofs which they had given of affection for their "excellent father." He enters into the theology of Eutychianism, associating it with Manicheism—an association which occurs in another letter of his, and which was long powerful at Constantinople against the denial of Two Natures. He says that those who deny the nature of our flesh to exist in Christ contradict the Gospel and resist the Creed, and implicitly set aside the truths of the Passion and the Resurrection. As Cyril had argued from the efficacy of the Eucharist to the divinity of

Him whose "life" was therein imparted, so Leo argues from what was received in the Eucharist to His true humanity; remarking that even little children (as communicants) know that what is given to them is the "Body and Blood" of Christ. The denial in question will in effect attribute the Lord's sufferings to His Godhead, unless it makes His body a phantom. Either conclusion is monstrous. Leo connects the truth of Christ's manhood with the work of the Second Adam, and with the incorporation of mankind under the Redeemer as a new Head. He takes care to condemn Nestorianism for asserting "that the Virgin bore a man without Godhead, who, having been created by the Spirit, was afterwards assumed by the Word." The letter in several respects appears to reproduce the celebrated Tome, especially in the interpretation of "My Father is greater than I" as referring to the manhood. He wrote yet again to Pulcheria on the 17th of March, acknowledging receipt of a letter which showed how much she loved the Catholic faith, how much she abhorred a heresy which in fact was striving to break up the very foundations of the Christian religion; and he repeated with "still greater confidence" his request for her zealous co-operation. At the same time he sent another letter to the abbots Martin and Faustus, referring to his former letter, which was sent not only with the authority of the apostolic see, but with the unanimous assent of a holy synod which had gathered around him in full numbers.

The last hope as to Theodosius was ere long frustrated. He sent a reply, some time in April, to his Western relations, briefly and confidently assuring them that they were quite mistaken as to the facts, and implying that "the most reverend patriarch" Leo had been misinformed. The recent Council had done nothing contrary to the rule of faith or to justice; it had only deposed "the author of the contention," who was "found guilty of a pernicious innovation." Thus, as Gibbon expresses it, "the pageant of Oriental royalty was moved by Chrysaphius as dexterously as that of Western by Leo; and Theodosius could pronounce without hesitation that the Church was already peaceful and triumphant, and that the recent flame had been extinguished by the just punishment of the Nestorians." This absolute failure of Leo to impress a sovereign who was even superstitiously respectful to Eastern ascetics is proof enough that the bishop of Rome, even when exceptionally vigorous, was not then regarded as the spiritual ruler of Christendom.

Leo must at last—by what means, or why not earlier, we know not—have received decisive information of Flavian's death, when, on the 16th of July, he addressed one more letter to Theodosius, referring to a letter in which the Emperor had enforced the authority of the Nicene faith, and proceeding to explain why he had not as yet written to Anatolius. It was not, he protests, from unfriendliness; it was simply because he had not as yet received any guarantee of his orthodoxy. He requires nothing which any Catholic would refuse: let Anatolius read Cyril's (second) letter to Nestorius, and the acts of the (former) Council of Ephesus, and "not disdain, also, to read Leo's own letter," which he would find to harmonize entirely with the "pious teaching of the fathers"—words, let us say in passing, which would have been scarcely possible for Leo, if he had meant to impose the Tome as binding on the whole Church simply because it was his own *ex cathedra* pronouncement. He proceeds: Anatolius will thus learn what sort of assurance is expected from him; let him draw it up, sign it, have it read publicly, transmit it to the apostolic see and to all bishops; thus will peace be secured. But he must, Leo adds, "renounce communion with all who hold otherwise as to the Incarnation than I with all Catholics hold. Two bishops and two priests, now sent as bearers of this letter, will give fuller explanations. But *if* any persons dissent from the true faith, let the Emperor grant a General Council to be held in Italy, as the Roman synod has already requested." This "*if*" is remarkable; Leo finds it expedient to modify his demands. He no longer insists that the proceedings at Ephesus shall be cancelled; he no longer asks absolutely for a new Council: he makes his request hypothetical and contingent—*if* any persons shall differ from a satisfactory statement when put forth by "the bishop of Constantinople;" for so, in the second section of his letter, he describes Anatolius. He wrote again to Pulcheria, saying that he had deferred writing fraternally to Anatolius, merely because he was awaiting some manifestation of his orthodox faith: "disagreeable events had preceded his ordination, and he ought to have written what might prove him to be clear of the errors that had recently sprung up." Let him either assent to Cyril's (second) epistle to Nestorius, or to Leo's own letter to Flavian "of holy memory:" the alternative clearly supposes that for Anatolius, with his antecedents, Cyril's language might naturally have more weight than his own. Again he makes the assembling of a new Council depend on the result of such a profession of faith by Anatolius.

Theodosius never received Leo's letter. He had sustained fatal injuries in the spine by a fall from his horse near the river Lycus, just outside the line of the walls that bore his name: he was carried home in a litter, and died on the ensuing night, in the forty-third year of his reign, on the 28th of July, 450. The stumbling of a horse produced important results in the cases of our "first" and "third" Williams, and in the present case, as Gibbon remarks, changed the fortunes of a great doctrinal controversy. Pulcheria, whose power had suffered an eclipse, became sole Empress, and then espoused an elderly senator named Marcian, who had once been a servant of Aspar, the powerful general of the Eastern forces, and who was eminent, says Evagrius, for justice, humanity, compassionateness, and fidelity to obligations—we may add, for manliness such as had not of late been exhibited on the Constantinopolitan throne. Pulcheria had already, as her first act of sovereignty, sent Chrysaphius to execution, and thereby deprived Eutyches of a godson who had bound the imperial despotism to his cause.

Marcian had hardly been on the throne a month before he wrote to Leo in terms very different from those to which the Pope had of late been accustomed. It was right, he felt, to address the "leading episcopal guardian of the true faith" before writing to any others; and he at once held out the prospect of a new Council, at which, by the weight of Leo's "authority"—that is, evidently, of his presiding influence—peace may be established on the basis of Catholic belief. There was indeed a "changed world." Pulcheria's sentiments were well known; her husband was earnestly desirous of restoring, if possible, the internal unity of the Church; and it was afterward said by one who cherished intense resentment against Dioscorus, that the latter, as if conscious that his career of ascendancy had received a fatal check, hired certain persons to stop the proclamation in Alexandria of the new monarch's accession to the throne. Marcian wrote again to Leo on the 22nd of November, telling him that he had cordially received the Roman delegates, who had reached Constantinople after his predecessor's death. Then as to the Council: what Marcian would like best would be that Leo should come into the Eastern empire, and there preside over the assembly. "But if," he proceeds in effect, "this would be troublesome for you, write to me yourself, that I may summon the bishops of all the East, of Thrace, and of Illyricum, to some specified place selected by myself for the purpose."

Pulcheria wrote to Leo shortly afterwards, and informed him that Anatolius had signed the Tome, and thus had given sufficient evidence of his soundness; that a Council was determined upon; that the body of Flavian had been brought home and buried with his predecessors in the Church of the Apostles; and that her husband had recalled the bishops who with Flavian had been sent into exile. In fact, Anatolius, who was evidently not a man of any elevation of character, had seen reason under the new reign to detach himself from the Eutychianizers; and it appears from documents of the Fourth Council, and from another letter of Leo's, that a large number of bishops were at this time assembled at Constantinople, that the Tome was signed by them, and that it was sent for signature to absent metropolitans and also to the new patriarch of Antioch, who signed it on seeing the signature of Anatolius and recommended it by "*tractoriæ*," or circulars, to the bishops of the Orient. Florentius of Sardis, at Chalcedon, speaks of himself as having signed the Tome; Cecropius of Sebastopolis said that the bishops in general had done so. A list of signatures was made out, and sent to Leo by the hands of a priest and two deacons, who also conveyed to him a letter from Anatolius, in which he spoke of certain bishops who repented of the weakness with which they had submitted to Dioscorus at Ephesus, and desired to be recognised by Leo as within his communion. Of these bishops, Leo's deputies declared that they must be for the present content to communicate with their own Churches: they also insisted that the names of Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Eustathius of Berytus, should not be recited at the altar, *i.e.* that they should be treated as excommunicate.

Theodoret's delight and gratitude at once expressed themselves in various letters. "Our benignant Lord," he writes to bishop Romulus, "has cut away entirely all reasons for alarm. If I had as many mouths as I have hairs, I could not praise Him enough." He adds in the words of a psalmist, "The Lord has awakened as one out of sleep." For himself, he was not eager to return to his city: it appears that he had been banished by Theodosius to his monastery near Apamea; and he would not take advantage of an imperial permission to return home until his case had been heard by the impending Council. All that he cared about, he said, was to see the truth of the Gospel established. But this could only be done by a new œcumenical Council, and meantime the truth was making its voice heard; the falsehood taught by the new heresy

was proscribed ; and as he quaintly expresses it, with a humour which is characteristic of his letters, one person “on hearing of anathemas pronounced (against Eutyches) in the great cities, left off imitating the gait of a crab, and took a straight line as to doctrine in a certain festival discourse. But,” he adds gravely, “we ought not to accommodate our language to the times, but always to keep the rule of truth free from deviation.”

It is at first sight rather strange—it looks like vacillation or caprice—that Leo should not write again to Constantinople, after receiving the letters of the Emperor and Empress, until the 13th of April, 451 ; that he should send back the three clerics of Anatolius with a very short letter of thanks to Marcian, which did not touch the question of a Council, and with a longer one to Pulcheria in which also he said not a word about it, while he was diffuse in praising the Empress as having always proved herself “the handmaid and disciple of the truth” whether it were assailed by Nestorius or by Eutyches, and as having now gained a second victory. He thanked her for her kind reception of his legates, who would inform her as to “what ought to be done or arranged,” and for the honours paid to Flavian’s memory ; while as to the prelates who repented of their subserviency to Dioscorus, he would grant them his communion on their written repudiation of “what had been done amiss.” She would be glad to hear that Eusebius of Dorylæum was with him. At the same time he wrote his first letter to Anatolius, accepting and rejoicing in the assurance of his orthodoxy, which should involve that of the Constantinopolitan Church. If the penitent bishops will make full amends, and anathematize the error which they had formerly sanctioned, he will admit them to his communion, in a manner to be agreed upon between Anatolius and the legates. Such a grace is not to be given indiscriminately, nor withheld in a spirit of harshness from such as shall have made satisfaction. He adds that he wishes Julian of Cos, and the clergy who have been faithful adherents of Flavian, to adhere to Anatolius as Flavian’s lawful successor. To Julian he wrote in this sense : “I sympathize with you in your past tribulations. It was very hard to have to live among the enemies of the faith : you wrote to me that you had thought of coming home to Italy, but now I am glad that you were able to stay safely among those who have now given their assent to my doctrine. You must be vigilant against future crafts of heresy, as you have been in the past. Although some grieve over their errors,

others persevere in their obstinacy; and these last must be put down, if they cannot be brought over." After despatching these letters, Leo received another from Marcian, conveyed by Tatian, prefect of Constantinople, which is now lost; but we have Leo's reply, dated on the 23rd of April. In it he now at last approaches the subject of a Council: he felt that the thing was inevitable: his main point is that there must be no attempt to reopen the question of doctrine, or discuss whether Eutyches's opinions were impious, or whether the sentences pronounced by Dioscorus were unjust—these matters, he contends, are not open to question. This shows how bent he was on tying the Council's hands at the outset: he was just as little disposed to allow of discussion, just as much determined to treat the matter of doctrine as absolutely settled, as Dioscorus had been before the "Latrocinium." He promises Marcian a fuller explanation of his views about the Council by the legates whom he intends forthwith to send. He had meant, he says, to send them together with the Constantinopolitan legates who took back his letters of April 13th; but he had then taken for granted that his former legates would by that time have returned. As it turned out, they did not come in time; and this was the reason for his delaying to send the second set of legates with those of Constantinople. Even now, ten days later, they are not ready to go to Marcian.

This alteration in Leo's tone about the Council, this hesitation in sending his legates, is highly significant. Before Theodosius died, he was eager, impatient, urgent for a new Council: it was the one hope for distracted Christendom; it must be held, and held in Italy. He had implored the Western court to move the Eastern in this direction: he wrote himself to that court: he did not refrain from using the language of humble entreaty. But now, when an orthodox Empress is seconded by an orthodox Emperor, when both of them tell Leo that a Council is at last to meet, Leo is ominously silent on the subject in his first letters to them, and in this last letter he is chiefly anxious to circumscribe the scope of the Council's deliberations. Why this change? we ask. Partly because he had come to think that his objects were in the way to being secured without any Council,—that the special need for the Council no longer existed; partly because, for reasons to be presently mentioned, it would even be difficult to hold one; but we shall do him no injustice if we think that with him it had been an essential part of the scheme that the Council should be held in Italy, where his

own personal predominance could be exerted and felt. Even before Theodosius's death, he had come to think that this condition might prove impracticable, and that it would suffice if Anatolius could carry the Easterns with him on lines of orthodoxy. But when Marcian has unequivocally and resolutely signified his own intention of deciding where the Council should meet, Leo's interest in the plan not only cools but dies out. In existing circumstances he had rather not have a Council at all. He turns round, so to speak, on Marcian, just when Marcian is going to give him what Theodosius had been importuned for in vain. It is a singular situation. He feels its awkwardness, and, instead of fully explaining himself, prefers to send oral explanations through the promised deputation with all convenient speed.

At last, about six weeks later, he finds himself in a position to send his new legates, Lucentius bishop of Asculum, and Basil a presbyter; and he writes to Marcian on the 9th of June. He acknowledges the receipt of the letter which his former legates, now arrived, had brought home to him from Marcian. The larger part of his reply is devoted to the subject of the penitent bishops: his legates, he says, are to consult with Anatolius. At last he comes to the delicate point: "It was even I myself, as your Grace" (literally, "Clemency") "remembers, who requested that a synod should be held. But the difficulties of the present time do not at all permit the assembling of the bishops of all the provinces," because of the wars which disturb the provinces chiefly in question. So "let your Grace order the matter to be reserved for a more convenient time." By this date he had indeed serious reason for referring to the disturbed state of various Western "provinces;" for he must have heard of the invasion of Gaul by Attila, when "city after city of France north-east of the Seine fell before him;" of the horrible massacres at Metz on Easter Even (April 1), when, as Gregory of Tours expresses it, the Huns "killed the priests themselves before the sacred altars," and left nothing in the city unburnt except an "oratory of St. Stephen," their fury, however, as Hodgkin says, being directed rather against civilization than against religion. At the same time Leo's zeal about a new Council had obviously subsided before he received the news of this invasion; and one cannot but suspect that he was taking some advantage of it, in order to adjourn the question of an assembly which (as popes have so often felt) might be somewhat difficult to manage,—might insist on discussing points which he desired to keep high above discussion.

An accompanying letter to Pulcheria is chiefly interesting for the information it gives us about Eutyches. It seems that Marcian had removed him from his monastery to some other place in the immediate neighbourhood of Constantinople: Leo begs that he may be sent to a greater distance, where he will "no longer be solaced by the frequent visits of those whom he has led astray," and that a "Catholic abbot" may be set over his monastery. The same day he writes again to Anatolius, whom, with the legates, he has "charged with the carrying out of his arrangements"—he could afford to take this high tone with a prelate to whom his good opinion was worth so much. The rank and file of those who gave way at Ephesus may be absolved on clear evidence of repentance. But as for the leaders, those who held "a higher place in that unhappy Council," if any of them show a repentance that seems genuine, let their case be reserved "for the riper judgment of the apostolic see." Meantime, none of those persons whose position is thus under consideration ought to be named at the altar. Ten days later, he sends Anatolius a short note as to two presbyters, Basil and John, who, in their anxiety to keep clear of opposite heresies, Nestorian and Eutychian, had taken a journey from Constantinople to Rome, and made a satisfactory profession of their belief to Leo, who therefore commended them, on their return, to the "favour" of their own bishop.

Leo did not know, when he wrote to Marcian on the 9th of June, that it was then too late to suggest a postponement of the Council. Marcian's letters of convocation had been sent forth on the 17th of May, summoning the metropolitans of his empire to assemble, with such of their suffragans as they might think fit, at Nicæa on the 1st of September. The Emperor had probably not heard of any change of view on the part of Leo; but, had he known of it, he was not likely to have dropped a serious resolution of this kind on that account. He did knowingly traverse Leo's wishes as to the scene of the Council. It should not be in Italy; it should be on the venerable spot hallowed by the gathering of the 318—this apparently was Pulcheria's suggestion. Leo was mortified, and showed it in his next letters to the Eastern court (June 24, 26). "I had believed that your Grace would have been able to grant my wish, and put off the Council until the bishops of all provinces could be represented and a really universal Council could be held." However, since it is to be now, Leo will make the best of it (as he had made the best of Theodosius's resolution to assemble a General Council in 449): he therefore appoints as

his legate Paschasinus of Lilybæum in Sicily, a bishop from a province just then specially undisturbed by fears of war; with him are associated a presbyter named Boniface, the two former legates (Lucentius of Asculum and the presbyter Basil), and Julian of Cos. They are to act "without enmity or favour" for the maintenance of the faith as against both Nestorian and Eutychian error; and Paschasinus is to preside in Leo's name—the office of presiding having been already, naturally and reasonably, designed by Marcian for Leo. Two days later he wrote another letter to the like purport: "I had begged your Grace to order the Council which I had asked for, and which you deem necessary, to be put off a little until a more opportune time, that those bishops who are detained by the fear of enemies might assemble with minds more free from all perturbation. But since you, in a religious spirit, determine to make divine things take precedence of human, I, for my part, will not resist your arrangements; and I wish that the result may be to confirm all in that faith which cannot but be one." He dwells on the importance of an equal zeal against the two opposite errors; he praises Marcian for having virtually annulled the acts of that assembly "which could not be called a Council;" he urges that in the coming Council the faith handed down from the apostles must not be called in question, and that the Nicene faith must be upheld apart from the heretics' interpretation of it. He names the legates who are to represent him in the synod. To Anatolius he writes complaining that, even apart from difficulties caused by war, the time allowed for collecting the bishops was very limited. How could he send through such diverse and distant provinces in order to secure universality, in the proper sense, for the Council? He mentions his legates, and says that they are to act throughout with Julian, whose fidelity he has often proved. To the latter he sends a brief letter, in which occurs the significant clause, "I know that you have a fuller knowledge than my legates of what has taken place there."

The same date is attached to a letter addressed to the Council as summoned to Nicæa. He begins by saying that he had wished that all bishops had remained in the same devotedness to the faith; but much had taken place which was matter for repentance, and since divine mercy was greater than the faults of offenders, and punishment was suspended in order to give time for amendment, it was well to adopt the Emperor's "pious counsel" (observe the euphemism), whereby he had willed the bishops to

assemble, and had maintained St. Peter's honour by inviting him, Leo, to attend. This he could not do, having regard to the difficulties of the time, and also to precedents. "But," he goes on, "you are to consider that I am presiding" (this point he slips in, so to speak, as a matter of course) "by Paschasinus and Lucentius, Boniface and Basil, who are sent from the apostolic see." He exhorts the Council to take as its doctrinal basis the "full and lucid" statement of the mystery of the Incarnation contained in his own letter to Flavian. But the first business for the Council will be to reinstate bishops who have been wrongly deposed, and eject those who have been intruded into their places. If all who have erred should repent, they should be upheld in their dignity; but the foremost duty would be that of restoring in fulness of privilege, to the rights of which they had been deprived, those who had laboured for the faith. Great care must be taken to maintain intact the decisions of the former Council of Ephesus, over which "Cyril of blessed memory presided," lest Nestorianism should be encouraged by the condemnation of Eutychianism—a point on which he was always most explicit, and which constitutes one of his chief merits as a theologian. The immediate peril does not lead him to forget the more remote: he feels that the present attack on one side of the truth is a reaction from a previous attack on the opposite side, and might produce another reaction.

Some weeks later, on the 20th of July, Leo wrote again to Marcian. He still harped a little on his two disappointments—that the Council was not to be postponed as he had wished; and that it was to be held at Nicæa, and not in Italy, as he had urgently requested. But he says that as soon as he received the Emperor's letter summoning the Council, he had sent word to Paschasinus to sail from Sicily, and had despatched his other legates from Rome: therefore, although (here he touches on another grievance) the time allowed is too short, he hopes all will be able to meet, and establish the faith handed down through the fathers, as to which no discussion should be allowed. A parallel letter was addressed to Pulcheria, from which it would appear that it was by her special wish, as has been said, that the Council was fixed at Nicæa—although he adds that she would recollect that he had wished it to be held in Italy. As to the treatment of the penitent bishops—those who had been harshly treated at Ephesus by the men who had drawn them aside from their fidelity—he has never said that they are not to be forgiven

on repentance. In words which remind us of our own Consecration Service, "*So minister discipline that you forget not mercy,*" Leo declares that "*we so exercise the justice which comes of resentment that we do not lose the healing virtues of charity.*" "Almost all who were either deceived or coerced into yielding to the presidents of the Ephesian assembly have retracted their consent, and condemned what they then wrote, and have thus obtained a perpetual abolition of their fault, and the grace of apostolic peace," *i.e.* of communion with Rome. He adds that even as to the authors of this "cruel tempest," he has provided for some abatement of the "usual" discipline, in the hope of leading them to some compunction. Even they still "hold their sees"—he means that no sentence of deposition has been pronounced against them, although he had said that their names ought not to be recited at the Eucharist; and it is still open to them, by a "real and necessary amendment," to be again at peace with the whole Church. This is the letter in which he uses the term "*latrocinium.*" Its language as to the possibility of admitting even the worst offenders at Ephesus to reconciliation throws some light on the question whether Dioscorus's most daring act, his formal excommunication of Leo, drawn up in the presence of some ten Egyptian bishops, took place when he was at Nicæa on some business before the death of Theodosius, or when he had come up for the Council. It seems difficult to believe that, if Dioscorus had already taken such a step, Leo would on this occasion have ignored it; yet if it was, as the other alternative supposes, a "stroke of despair"—to adopt Tillemont's expression—one can only suppose that Dioscorus, at the very crisis of his fortunes, had cast away every shred of prudence.

Marcian had considerable difficulty in repressing the desperate movements of the Eutychians of Constantinople. If there were abbots whom Leo treated as correspondents and fellow-labourers, the monastic body still included not a few who had looked up to Eutyches as their chief, and who now viewed him as a persecuted confessor. Eighteen monks describing themselves as archimandrites, of whom Carosus is named first, petitioned the Emperor to call a General Council—which indeed, they added, he had already consented to do—and meanwhile to protect them from being persecuted by the clergy, and ousted from monasteries, churches, or chapels of martyrs. They would not sign the Tome—so we learn from the statement of their opponents—and Anatolius found

himself obliged to depose one of them, Gerontius, with a priest named Calopodius, from the priesthood. The Catholic abbots, also eighteen in number, headed by Leo's correspondents Faustus and Martin, presented a counter-memorial to Marcian, praying that the Eutychianizing memorialists might be subjected to the "spiritual statutes of monks," and that they themselves might be allowed to take measures against them. The subject received further treatment at Chalcedon.

Theodoret had urged the patrician Anatolius to induce Marcian to attend the Council in person, "in order to terrify the adversaries by his presence and preserve the truth from opposition." Such an argument was hardly worthy of such a man; and Tillemont half ironically remarks that Theodoret must "have felt very sure of Marcian's moderation and prudence, since it was difficult for a prince thus to appear in an assembly without giving people occasion to say that its decrees had been suggested rather by his authority than by freedom of votes and love for the truth—a thing which brings odium and suspicion on the best causes." Marcian was, indeed, as little likely as any sovereign to tyrannize over the Church; and Leo's delegates were urgent with him that he should come in person, even protesting that they would not attend unless he did so. He found it necessary to defer the opening of the Council in order to arrange for the defence of Eastern Illyricum against incursions of the Huns. He therefore sent a short note to the Council at Nicæa, asking them to wait for his arrival. The delay gave occasion to some disputes: and Pulcheria was advised to issue an order to Strategus, the "consular" governor of Bithynia, for the expulsion from Nicæa of all clerics, monks, and laics, who were there without authority from the government or permission from their own bishops, in order that the Council might do its work with all seemly tranquillity; it being expressly added that "no principle warranted the invitation of monks or laics to a synod." The bishops who had assembled were vexed at the postponement: as on other occasions, they could but little brook a period of enforced inaction in a provincial city away from their own homes. That curious tendency, under such circumstances, to fall ill, which had appeared in the June of 431 at Ephesus, reappeared in the September of 451 at Nicæa. They therefore wrote to Marcian, who kindly answered that, although he had grave political reasons for staying where he was, yet he would make everything give way to the interest of the orthodox faith.

He would therefore come as soon as he could ; and it would be most convenient for him if they would remove from Nicæa to Chalcedon, which was a larger city in itself and also much nearer to Constantinople. And further, on being informed by “ Atticus ” (rather Aetius), archdeacon of Constantinople, that some of the bishops objected to Chalcedon as a place too much exposed to possible disturbances on the part of the Eutychians of the capital, he wrote a third time, on the 22nd of September, exhorting them to come forthwith to Chalcedon and to lay aside all such fears as they had expressed. The scene, therefore, transfers itself to Chalcedon.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.—PART I.

ON Monday, the 8th of October, the Council met near the city of Chalcedon, in the long and stately pillared nave of the church of St. Euphemia, a virgin martyr under Galerius, whose name, curiously enough, became popular in Scotland, and is familiar to us through "The Heart of Midlothian." The Church historian Evagrius, in describing the situation, shows a sense of the picturesque. From the gentle eminence on which "St. Euphemia's" stood, the eye ranged over a level stretch of fields and woodlands to the Bosphorus as it expanded into the Propontis; and memory might recall the Persian general's remark, that the founders of Chalcedon must have been blind to neglect such a site as that of Byzantium. The church itself had been the scene of a conference between Arcadius and Gainas. Those who entered it—apparently from the west—passed through an open court into the nave, which evidently had a chancel or sanctuary beyond it; but to the north-east there was a domed chapel, containing the silver shrine of the saint. The fact that the Council had been "gathered together by the commandment and will" of a sovereign prince was emphasized by the conspicuous position assigned to sixteen representatives of the Emperor—including the prætorian prefect of the East, the prefect of Constantinople, the master of the offices, the counts of the body-guard and the private treasure—and of the senate. For convenience, we may apply the term "commissioners" to both classes: in the Conciliar acts the special delegates of the Emperor are called *archontes*, or, in the Latin version, *judices*. The presence of these high civil dignitaries, seated in front of the sanctuary *cancelli*, and doubtless on each side of "the holy doors" in the centre, was an imposing and unmistakable expression of the State's interest in, and determination to keep an effective hold over,

the transaction of ecclesiastical business in the synod. Their proper function, indeed, might be called external: they were to prescribe the lines of procedure, to open and close the sessions, to take the votes, to sanction proposals to be brought forward, and generally to preserve judicial and deliberative order. Yet, in fact, they could not but repeatedly intervene in matters which belonged to the synod's internal work. At one critical moment, as we shall see, they pressed the adoption of a particular theological phrase, as against another with which the majority were at first satisfied; they took the first step in the deposition of a prelate who ranked third at least in the whole hierarchy; and at the end of the proceedings they overruled the opposition or protest of Leo's own deputies.

The numbers given in the lists are clearly defective. There were present, personally or by deputies (who were either bishops, or chorepiscopi, or presbyters), about 600; so that this was a much more numerous gathering than Nicæa or Ephesus had witnessed. Yet it was all but exclusively Eastern. As at Ephesus, the Gospel-book was placed on a raised seat in the midst, as a reminder of the presence of the Lord. The Roman deputies—we may call them "legates" if we detach from that term its mediæval associations—sat, together with the patriarch of Antioch, the primates of Asia Minor, and other prelates of the Pontic, Asian, Thracian, and Oriental "dioceses," those of Palestine excepted, on the left of the commissioners, which, contrary to our notions, was esteemed the place of honour. The right-hand seats were occupied by Dioscorus with some of his suffragans, Juvenal of Jerusalem and the Palestinian bishops, and those of Eastern Illyricum. The representatives of Rome were in form only "first voters;" but they took care to lead the debates, they lost no opportunity of asserting their master's dignity—frequently in terms which Eastern bishops would not have used—and on the whole succeeded in discharging the function of ecclesiastical presidents.

Paschasinus of Lilybæum, Leo's chief legate, began the real proceedings of the Council by announcing that "the Pope of Rome, the head of all churches, had ordered that Dioscorus should not sit in the Council. Either, then," he continued, addressing the commissioners, "let him go out, or else we will go out." This overbearing tone of objection was followed up by an explanation which could not have been justified by facts: "He held a synod without the permission of the apostolic see, a thing never done before, and not lawful; it would be a wrong

both to yourselves and to us, that he should sit who ought to be tried." The commissioners, addressing another legate, who had spoken in the same sense, pointedly observed, "If you come here as a judge, you must not plead as an advocate;" but they compromised the matter by directing Dioscorus to sit apart in the midst of the church. This was reasonable enough, for his conduct in the Latrocinium was to come under review; and the legates "sat down and were silent." Then came the reading of a petition by Eusebius of Dorylæum to the Emperor, desiring that Dioscorus might be called upon to answer for that conduct; whereupon Dioscorus calmly asked that the minutes of the Ephesian Council, held by imperial order, might be read. Accordingly the citation was read which excluded Theodoret from attendance at that Council; whereupon the commissioners directed the admission of Theodoret, because Leo had "restored to him his see," and the Emperor had commanded him to appear. A word must here be said about the former statement; it may be illustrated by Socrates's assertion that Maximin of Jerusalem, then a suffragan of Cæsarea, "restored Athanasius's dignity" to him in 346, and that Cyril and John, at their reunion, "restored to each other their sees," *i.e.* recognised each other as legitimate bishops. Theodoret had been thus recognised by Leo; yet his entrance raised one of those wild storms of angry excitement which show how strong the "Greek" spirit was even within the ecclesiastical area. The bishops of Egypt, Illyricum, and Palestine, who throughout represented the most vehement anti-Nestorian feeling, shouted out, "The canons expel this man: turn out the teacher of Nestorius!" On the other hand, the "Oriental" and the Pontic bishops exclaimed, "Turn out the Manicheans!" a nickname, as we have seen, applied to Eutychianizers, as supposed to deny the human reality of Christ's "flesh." They added a still more ominous demand, "Turn out Dioscorus the murderer!" The commissioners ruled that Theodoret, having received again his own place from the "archbishop of Rome" and having been approved as orthodox by his own Antiochene patriarch, was in his rights as a competent accuser, without prejudice to any one's right to accuse him in turn. Accordingly, he sat down in the midst, probably beside Dioscorus, amid conflicting shouts of "He is worthy!" and "He is no bishop!" It was necessary for the commissioners to remind the excited partisans that "mob-like outcries" — they were doubtless alluding to scenes in the

Constantinopolitan hippodrome—"were unseemly for bishops, and did no service to either side." The reading went on, with frequent interruptions; thus, when Dioscorus affirmed that the bishops present at the recent Ephesian synod had assented to all that there took place, the "Orientals" shouted out, "No! it was done by force, by force and blows; soldiers with sticks and swords rushed in upon us!" The Egyptians chose to assume that these speakers were clerics in attendance on bishops, and exclaimed, "This is a synod of bishops, not of clerics; turn out those who do not belong to it;" and when several bishops bore testimony to the duress, the trickery, and the intimidation which had been employed in the Latrocinium, they sneered bitterly at "the cowardice thus acknowledged." When it appeared that Flavian at Ephesus had been degraded to the fifth place, Paschasius remarked, "You see, *we* treat Anatolius as second"—a bit of diplomacy which might serve the purpose of the moment, but was clean against Rome's refusal to acknowledge the canons of 381. Then as to the fact that the Tome had not been read at Ephesus; the responsibility for this omission was cast on Dioscorus, who replied that he had twice ordered it to be read. Juvenal was asked why this order had not been complied with. He made a paltry excuse: "An imperial letter was at once produced which claimed precedence." But why was not Leo's letter read afterwards? The only reply was, "No one said he had it ready!" On the question of the correctness of the Ephesian minutes, or "acts," the bishop of Ephesus declared that his secretaries had been assaulted by those of Dioscorus, who "blotted out what they had taken down, and almost broke their fingers in trying to wrench away their pen-holders." When Eutyches's confession of faith was read, including the statement that Cyril had sent him copies of the Ephesian ruling against any alteration of the Creed, Eusebius impulsively exclaimed, "There is no such ruling or canon existing." Dioscorus calmly observed that, although there was no "canon" to that effect, there was a "ruling," which would be found in the "codices." The bishop of Cyzicus ventured to criticize the employment by Eutyches of the strictly Nicene form: "He purposely ignores the additional words, 'of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin.'" Naturally the Egyptians repudiated any addition to the Nicene text. Eusebius said that Eutyches had not been sufficiently explicit as to the origin of Christ's flesh. Dioscorus replied that he

himself was not concerned to defend any individual, but simply to uphold the faith; if Eutyches was heterodox, he deserved to be *burned*—an echo of the horrible outcries against Ibas. This remark has an historical importance. Dioscorus and the Egyptian Church as adhering to him were willing to draw a distinction between their Monophysitism and that of Eutyches: he might be an “extreme” man—they were not committed to him; and this position is maintained to this day by the Coptic Church, which professes to regard the Godhead and manhood as forming one composite nature. The discussion next took a personal turn in reference to Basil of Seleucia. At Ephesus, he said, the reading of his own statement made at the Constantinopolitan synod, affirming the Incarnate Christ to exist “in two natures,” produced a furious uproar; he had been fairly unnerved, and had said, in bewilderment and terror, that he “did not remember” to have used such language; and he added, “If I had been dealing with magistrates, I would have endured martyrdom;” meaning that he would have resisted secular, though he yielded to ecclesiastical, pressure. At this point the “acts” of Ephesus begin to include those of Constantinople; so that, by what Gibbon calls a “double involution,” we have to extract the record of 448 from that of 449, and that of 449 from that of 451, and thus Chalcedon supplies us with what happened at Constantinople and at Ephesus. Among the Constantinopolitan acts was the letter of Cyril to John, *Lætentur cæli*. The Illyrian prelates, always on the watch against Nestorianism, cried out, “We believe as did Cyril!” Thereupon Theodoret anathematized those who “asserted two Sons;” all the bishops, it is added, echoed the profession of agreement with Cyril, by way of repudiating Nestorian proclivities; but when Cyril’s negation of “two natures” and assertion of “one nature incarnate” was quoted by Eustathius, the Orientals cried out, “That is what Eutyches says, what Dioscorus says.” This gave Dioscorus another opportunity of disclaiming the idea of a “fusion” as well as of a division; and Eustathius added that “one nature incarnate” did not imply a denial of that “flesh of Christ which is co-essential with us,” and that “two natures” were only denied in the sense of a division of the one Son into two—in other words, that Cyril had condemned the phrase as Nestorians used it, and not otherwise. Flavian’s own statement of doctrine, as uttered at Constantinople, of which the central point was a confession of “one Christ, in one hypostasis, *from two natures*,” received the Council’s approval, Paschasinus

describing it as complete, an estimate which ere long he had to reconsider; and then those non-Egyptian bishops who sat on the same side with the suffragans of Dioscorus began to desert them, Juvenal setting the example, and being welcomed by the Orientals, "Well, has God brought thee over?" Greeks, Macedonians, and others followed suit; but Dioscorus, whose resourceful presence of mind was only equalled by his fearlessness, remarked that he had at hand passages accurately copied from Athanasius and Gregory as well as from Cyril, to the effect that it was wrong to speak of "two natures after the union." "If you expel me, you expel the Fathers with me." He admitted the phrase, "Christ is from two natures:" what he would not admit was that there were *now* two natures, that the Humanity was still co-existing with the Godhead, which, however, was just the point for which Leo had rightly contended. Further testimony as to the terrorism which Dioscorus had exercised was borne by Basil and Onesiphorus: and Basil, with a cheap boldness, taunted him as "even still domineering, although he had but six supporters left." At last—it is marvellous that an excitable assembly should have endured the tedium of such protracted readings—the acts of Constantinople, and then those of Ephesus, were got through; it had already become necessary to light candles; and the commissioners ruled that on the next day the subject of doctrine should be taken up, but that now, as it had been shown that Flavian and Eusebius had been unjustly deposed at Ephesus, Dioscorus and five others, leaders in that Council, Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil, should provisionally be subjected to the like sentence, *if* such were the pleasure of "our most divine and pious sovereign." The Orientals greeted this as a "just decision:" the Illyrians asked pardon for the weakness of which they had been guilty. The commissioners turned to another subject, and directed that each bishop should "set forth his own belief in writing, being aware that the Emperor believed in accordance with the expositions of 'the 318' and 'the 150,'" and with the expositions of Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, and the two canonical letters of Cyril confirmed by the first Council of Ephesus (*i.e.* his second and third letters to Nestorius, of which the former only had then received express approval); adding that Leo, in view of Eutyches's heterodoxy, had sent a letter to Flavian (the Tome)—which is thus ranked with other documents of high theological authority, instead of being considered, as on papal principles it

ought to have been considered, as possessing an unique claim on acceptance.

Some difficulty has been found in determining the actual sequence of the sessions reckoned as second and third. The second session, whatever was its subject, was held on October 10; the third on October 13. Evagrius makes the session in which Dioscorus's case was finally settled precede that in which the doctrinal question was dealt with. But on the whole the reasons for adhering to the order in the "Concilia" appear to predominate: the commissioners, as we have seen, had already determined that the doctrinal question should occupy the second session; and Liberatus, in his summary of events, adopts the same order. On this view, then, the session of October 10 opened with a request by the commissioners that the Council would undertake the task of expounding "the faith in its purity." But the term "exposition" (*ecthesis*) was elastic: it might mean a Creed, or it might mean a doctrinal statement of inferior authority; and many of the bishops hastily assumed that they were being asked to revise the Creed itself—a point on which they were not unreasonably sensitive. "We dare not do so," they exclaimed; "for the Fathers have taught (by it), and what they have set forth is extant in writing." Cecropius of Sebastopolis added that Leo had given a "model" of doctrinal statement, which he and others had signed. This of itself would show that he did not regard the Tome as on the same level with the Creed; for, in that case, to sign it would have been a virtual transgression of the Ephesian rule against putting forth "any other Creed than the Nicene," to which "rule" other prelates manifestly referred when they said that it was not "permissible" to make any new "exposition;" whereas no such rule could bar the composition or the acceptance of a document like the Tome, which did not profess to be, and was not accepted as, a Creed. The apprehension expressed was not allayed by a new proposal of the commissioners, that the "patriarchs" or primates of the several "dioceses" should, with the assistance of two or three bishops from each "diocese," draw up a formula of doctrine. The bishop of Sardis asked that time might be allowed, "although those prelates who had signed Leo's letter did not need any setting right;" and Cecropius again showed the view which he took of the Tome by ranking it with the doctrinal statements of Athanasius, Cyril, Celestine, Hilary, Basil, and Gregory (Nazianzen). He asked that the Creed might be read: it was read accordingly in its original Nicene form, but

with slight deviations, as the addition of "and again" before "He is coming," and the omission of "or created" among the anathemas; and it was greeted with acclamations combining the names of Cyril and Leo. The commissioners next gave orders that the exposition of "the 150 Fathers" should be read—meaning, of course, the enlarged creed in the form by this time regarded as Constantinopolitan. Then followed Cyril's second letter to Nestorius and his letter to John. Again the shouts arose: "We all so believe; pope Leo so believes: as Cyril believed, so do we!" The Tome was then read, and welcomed with acclamations. "Peter uttered this through Leo" (meaning, "Leo had brought out the true import of St. Peter's confession"): "This is what Cyril taught—Leo and Cyril taught alike—why was this not read at Ephesus?" But the Illyrian and Palestinian bishops found a difficulty in three passages of the Tome, which seemed to them to approximate to Nestorianism. Aetius endeavoured to meet their difficulties by producing two passages from Cyril, one of which, however, was not verbally equivalent to the sentence, "Each form does what belongs to it;" and Theodoret—which is observable—quoted another passage from Cyril's "Scholia." Still, however, some misgivings were felt; and the bishop of Nicopolis asked for an adjournment, in order that Cyril's third letter to Nestorius might be considered at leisure. In spite of impatient outcries from adverse quarters, the commissioners granted the request, and directed Anatolius to appoint a committee for the purpose; after which the partisan temper again broke loose on the subject of the proceedings of the previous sitting, and even the clerics of Constantinople took the liberty of making themselves heard. The Illyrians urged that the bishops who had provisionally been deposed should be pardoned and reinstated, and even included Dioscorus in the petition—"Dioscorus to the synod! Dioscorus to the churches!" On the other side cries broke forth, "To exile with the heretic, the Egyptian!"

The third session was occupied with the ecclesiastical decision of the case of Dioscorus. The commissioners were not present: they had already said their say, and left the final settlement to the Council. Two deputations were sent to summon "the most pious bishop Dioscorus:" his answer was somewhat evasive, but came to this, that he would come if the commissioners were present. At this point four Alexandrians—two deacons, a presbyter, and a layman—appeared with petitions "to Leo, oecumenical patriarch of

Great Rome, and to the Œcumenical Council," in which their own patriarch's conduct was bitterly impugned. Oppressive or even cruel behaviour, especially towards the friends or kindred of Cyril, misappropriation of funds given for the carrying out of pious designs and of an imperial dole of corn intended for poor churches, interference with the due exercise of civil authority, coercion used towards ten of his suffragans, lax morality, homicide, incendiarism, Origenistic heresy,—are all heaped up in a style betokening personal rancour and reminding us of the facility with which, in those ages, accusations were got up even against an Athanasius. The denunciations are coarsely overdone, and produce a recoil of scepticism; one feels that, whatever faults may have sullied the Egyptian primate's administration, a Dioscorus so black as these petitioners paint him would never have secured the confidence and loyalty of the great majority of the Christians of Egypt. We need hardly add that the Council is not responsible for the title given to Leo by the petitioners: it was Gregory the Great's mistake to imagine that it offered that title to his predecessor; it simply did not concern itself with criticizing the phraseology which, for their own purpose, these Alexandrians thought fit to use. A third summons went to Dioscorus: he declined to give any further answer: "What I have said, I have said, and that is enough for me." On the receipt of this report, the legates, as presidents, asked the Council to signify its pleasure. What ought to be done to Dioscorus? He had contumaciously ignored the three citations: ought the canonical penalties to follow? The Council assented: one bishop expressly asked the legates, as presiding in the place of Leo, to promulgate the due sentence. Once again Paschasinus asks, "What pleases your blessednesses?" The bishop of Antioch replies, "Whatever seems good to your holinesses, we will vote accordingly." Then Paschasinus and his colleagues declare that "Dioscorus has been found guilty of many offences; he ignored Flavian's sentence against Eutyches, and of his own authority received him into communion before he sat in synod with other bishops at Ephesus. To them the apostolic see has extended pardon for what they did under constraint, because they have become obedient to archbishop Leo and to the Œcumenical Council; whereas he glories in acts for which he ought rather to mourn. Also, in spite of his own promise, he did not allow Leo's letter to be read. Yet this might have been overlooked, if he had not dared to excommunicate Leo and to disregard the citations to attend and

answer to serious charges ; therefore Leo, by us and by the present holy synod, together with St. Peter, who is the rock of the Church and the basis of right faith, strips him of his episcopate." Did this sonorous utterance profess to be *the* sentence of the synod ? It might seem so, if one read no further ; but the legates add, " Now therefore the synod will vote in accordance with the canons," and the bishops proceed to fulfil their promise to " vote with the legates." Thus Anatolius " votes with them, agreeing in all points with the apostolic see." Maximus of Antioch " subjects him to ecclesiastical sentence, even as Leo and Anatolius have done ;" and " judges him to be alien from all episcopal dignity." Stephen of Ephesus says the like, employing the verb " to define." Repeatedly do other prelates, in the speeches ascribed to them, claim to " judge," " decide," " give sentence ;" repeatedly is the name of Anatolius combined with that of Leo ; others again attribute the sentence, which they severally make their own, to " the fathers" or leading prelates : so that, in order to represent them as only giving an intelligently obedient assent to the real sentence emanating exclusively from the legates, force has to be put upon plain words. In short, the legates, as " internal " presidents, are regarded as voting first, and therein as giving a lead to the Council ; but the deposition is the act of the whole body, and is carefully described as such in the notifications sent to Dioscorus, to his clergy, and to the laity of Constantinople and Chalcedon, and in the synodical letters which inform Marcian and Pulcheria that he has been " stripped of his episcopate by the Œcumenical Council,"—that "*we* have, with sorrow, denied him our communion, and against our wishes decreed him to be alien from episcopal dignity." As Maximus here appears in the acknowledged character of bishop of Antioch, it may be well to say that Leo's recognition of him was not the only ground on which he was allowed to occupy that position while Domnus was still living in retirement. Leo himself tells us that Maximus had proved his own orthodoxy by circulars sent throughout the provinces under his see ; and in a later session Stephen of Ephesus spoke of his appointment as from the first " canonical," on the ground, apparently, that Domnus had not claimed a reversal of the Latrocinian sentence by which he had been deposed.

The fourth session was held on October 17. The minutes of the first two sessions were read : then the commissioners requested the Council to express its mind on the subject of the faith. The legates, speaking through Paschasinus, referred to the Nicene

Creed, to its confirmation by the Council of Constantinople, to the acceptance of it by the Council of Ephesus under Cyril, and to the clear "expression of the true faith by the letter of Leo, archbishop of the churches, when he condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches." "The present Council," he said, "holds this faith, and can neither add to it nor take from it." This was echoed with acclamations. The commissioners then asked whether the Council considered the "expositions" of the 318 at Nicæa, and of the 150 at Constantinople, to be "in accord with Leo's letter." The sense of this phrase is illustrated by the reply of Anatolius: "The letter of Leo is in harmony with the Creed, and also with what was done at Ephesus under Cyril." Paschasinus then said, "It is plain that Leo's belief is in harmony with the Creed" in both its forms, and with the Ephesian definitions: *therefore* his letter is "one in purport with the Creed." This address is important, because Leo's own representative thus ignores any claim of infallibility, or intrinsic obligatory force, for Leo's letter as such, and is content to recommend it as in accordance with the Creed and with the Ephesian decision. Now begins a long series of episcopal utterances approving the Tome on the same grounds and no other. "It agrees, and I have signed it," clearly meaning, "I have signed it *because* I believe that it agrees with the standards in question:" "As far as I understand, it agrees:" "I am fully persuaded that it agrees:" "We have found it to agree:" "There can be no doubt that it agrees:" "We have accepted it as agreeing with the Creed, and as having the same purport." Theodoret says that it agrees with "the Creed put forth at Nicæa, and with the symbol of faith dictated at Constantinople, and with the letters of blessed Cyril"—he means the second to Nestorius and the letter to John. The representatives of an absent bishop say that when he had read the letter, and found it to agree, he signed it. Others say, "I see that the letter is in accordance:" Leo is "shown to have followed the Nicene faith, as did Cyril:" "I find in Leo's letter no divergence from the faith:" "I have found on examination that the letter in no wise differs;" and so on. It is true that in the great majority of cases the bishops appear to have already signed the Tome; but the point of importance is not in the when or where, but in the "why;" and their language, so closely akin to that in which Cyril's second letter to Nestorius received the sanction of the first Ephesian Council, bars out absolutely the supposition that they had accepted it on other grounds than that of personal approval. Not one single

bishop says or implies that he accepted it on Leo's sole authority. As at Ephesus Cyril's letter was tested by the Creed, and approved as standing the test, so at Chalcedon the bishops bear witness that they had tested Leo's Tome by the Creed and by the letter or letters of Cyril, and approved it accordingly. Ephesus had raised Cyril's letter to the rank of a Church standard next to, but not on equality with, the Creed; and here at Chalcedon a similar process takes place in regard to the Tome. The bishops who had asked for time to satisfy themselves professed that their difficulties had been removed by Anatolius and his committee: they now clearly understood that in accepting the Tome they would not be opening a door to Nestorianizers. The commissioners then elicited a general declaration of agreement with the Tome, and with this came a request that the five bishops implicated with Dioscorus in the misdeeds of the Latrocinium should be reinstated, as agreeing doctrinally with Leo. The commissioners answered that on this point they must take the Emperor's pleasure, but added that the Council must "answer to God" for having deposed Dioscorus without the knowledge of the Emperor or of themselves. This produced a shout of "It is God who deposed him!" It might look as if the commissioners were intimating some dissatisfaction with the sentence of the Council as to Dioscorus; but as they themselves had already given a provisional decision in the same sense, we must suppose that what they meant was simply to disown responsibility for proceedings at which they had not been present. The Emperor's permission being first obtained, the five bishops were admitted amid shouts of welcome from their brethren, who had reason to fear that extreme measures taken against all who had acted with Dioscorus would produce something very like a schism. Then appeared thirteen Egyptian bishops, who presented a memorial containing a virtual repudiation of the Apollinarianism which had so often been imputed to Egyptian Christology. But it was thought insufficiently explicit. Why had they not repudiated Eutychianism? That was the matter in hand: let them sign the letter of Leo. They protested—in accordance with their traditional obligations to the "throne of St. Mark"—that they could not act without an archbishop. "All Egypt would rise up against us: our lives would not be safe on our return: we had rather die here than there: give us an archbishop, and we will sign what you please." Not a little in the proceedings at Chalcedon is calculated to dispel any idealizing preconception as to a uniform

gravity and moderation in the conduct of ancient synods: the presence of human passion is too frequently manifest, although in no such hideous form as at Ephesus in 449. At the first Council of Ephesus there was, on the part of its leaders, an unfair precipitancy which gave only too good occasion to its opponents; and we know how sorely Gregory Nazianzen felt, how deeply he resented, the factious temper shown in the Council of Constantinople. So at Chalcedon there were several flashes of partisan violence; and nothing in its records is more unpleasing than the bullying tone (there is no other word for it) which the majority, including Paschasinus, exhibited towards these helpless and terrified Egyptians. No doubt they were regarded as representing the "brigandage" which had enabled their primate to carry his point at Ephesus; and the Orientals felt in effect that it was now their turn to dominate and to terrify. Again we find the lay officials interposing to secure some measure of fair play, not to say of humane considerateness, and ruling that the petitioners should be allowed to remain at Chalcedon—giving security, as Paschasinus had suggested—until a new appointment should be made to the see of Alexandria. Another set of petitioners followed: they were the abbots, or monks, or other persons of whom we have already heard as Eutychianizers; and they presented a memorial drawn up some time before, to the effect that, by deposing Dioscorus, the Council had transgressed the line marked out by the Emperor for its action, *i.e.* that of simply securing the Nicene faith. Among them was one whose presence naturally enough provoked a burst of indignation: it was Barsumas, "the man," said a bishop, "who stood over the blessed Flavian and cried, 'Stab him!'" and a fierce cry arose, "To the arena with the murderers!" But Aetius quietly went up to the petitioners, and assured them that nobody thought of altering the Creed, or of putting forth any new exposition in the sense of a creed—Leo's letter was only "an interpretation of its true meaning;" and, after much difficulty, he extracted from their spokesman a promise to condemn Eutyches *if* it were shown that he did not believe with the Church. There were abbots on the opposite side, who thought good to describe their opponents as "wild beasts meeting in a cave,"—meaning some obscure place where apparently a non-conforming worship was being carried on—and demanded that they should be excluded from it. Ultimately moderate counsels prevailed, and the obnoxious memorialists were allowed thirty days for consideration.

The acts assign to the 20th of October the settlement of a question between Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus, which in some respects resembled the dispute between St. Basil and Anthimus of Tyana. Theodosius had erected Berytus into a civil metropolis; and Eustathius thereupon, claiming authorization from what he called a Council in Constantinople—it was one of those gatherings of prelates on visits of business to the capital, which (as we have seen in the case of Flavian's "synod" of 448) acquired the name of the "sojourning synod"—asserted a metropolitan jurisdiction over six churches which had heretofore been suffragans of Tyre. He had even extorted from Photius, by threats, a recognition of this claim. Photius had treated the promise as void, and continued to consecrate bishops for the area in question; whereupon Eustathius induced Anatolius and the "sojourning synod" to excommunicate Photius in his absence, and for his own part degraded the newly consecrated bishops to the rank of presbyters. The Council decided in favour of Photius, and withal affirmed the principle that the relations of sees were to be settled not by "pragmatics" or imperial decrees, but by canonical regulation—this point being conceded by the commissioners; also that no one should be condemned in his absence, and that to allow a man to act as a priest when he was deemed unfit to act as a bishop was in effect sacrilegious. Anatolius did not come out very well in this matter, and found it best to minimise the authority of the so-called "sojourning synod." He did not claim for it the character of a synod, and declared that it had made no innovation in practice.

The fifth session, as it is reckoned, was held on the 22nd of October, and, as Hefele says, it is "one of the most important in Christian antiquity." First, a doctrinal formulary was read, which Anatolius and his committee had drafted. Unfortunately, it is not extant in the minutes. A minority, including the legates, thought that it did not sufficiently secure the point at issue, *i.e.* the definitive exclusion of Eutychianism. The majority called it "excellent," and demanded that "Nestorians" should be expelled, and that Theotocos should be added to the name of the Virgin Mary in the "symbol"—which implies that they had come to acknowledge the post-Nicene mention of her name as part of the "symbol:" but this proposal of the addition of even one word was a departure from their recent insistence on the Ephesian prohibition of any such change. The legates lost their temper:

"If," they said, "persons do not agree with Leo's letter, we will go home, and a synod shall meet there." They forgot, in effect, that they were not at home: the menace fell flat, the synod had got out of hand, and the commissioners resorted to the expedient (familiar to us in such difficulties) of proposing a committee to consist of Anatolius, "the pious men from Rome," six "Oriental" bishops, and three from each of the four "dioceses" called Asian, Pontic, Illyrian, and Thracian. No: the majority were bent on having the definition pure and simple; they even declared that it had been dictated by the Holy Spirit. "We all approve it! Sign it now! Mary is Theotocos, Christ is God: Turn out the heretics"—*i.e.* the supposed Nestorianizers. The commissioners began to explain wherein the formulary was deficient. "It speaks of Christ as *from*" (or *of*) "two natures: what Flavian was deposed for saying was that there *are* two natures: nothing short of this, therefore, is what now needs to be said." Anatolius, jealous for his own work, affirmed that Dioscorus had not been condemned for heresy, but for offences against order. The commissioners resumed: the Council, they argued, has already accepted Leo's letter: therefore it is bound to accept a phrase which is characteristic of that letter. And here they might as well have quoted from the Tome, "*In* the entire and perfect nature of true man was born true God, whole *in* what was His, whole *in* what was ours . . . on account of His oneness of Person to be understood as *existing in* both natures." As it was, the bishops who had to be conciliated had not any clear recollection of such passages in the Tome; they adhered, they said, to Leo's letter, but they would have the formulary as it stood. The commissioners had to fall back on the Emperor's authority: they sent to him for instructions, and obtained the decision that either the committee proposed must be set to work, or the bishops must individually express their faith through their metropolitans, or a synod would have to be held in the West because they had refused to define the faith explicitly. This was a considerable stretch of imperial "supremacy;" but it did not bear down opposition; with loyal shouts of "Long live the Emperor!" was combined a self-asserting determination, "Let the definition stand, or we will go." The Illyrians spoke out more plainly: "Let those who object be off to Rome!" At last a somewhat fuller explanation, which had better have been given earlier, brought out the point at issue with unmistakable distinctness. "Dioscorus," said the commissioners, "admits that Christ is

from two natures; what he does not admit is that there *are* two natures in Christ" (that is, that they both now exist in Him); "but that is just what Leo asserts. Now then, which of the two do you follow—Leo or Dioscorus?" Put in this way, the argument told. "We believe with Leo." "Very well; then insert in the definition that there *are* two natures in Christ;" in other words, that He exists not only from, but in, two natures. Thus, where the legates had failed—probably through the imperiousness of their tone—the lay dignitaries, with the argument from consistency and with the Emperor behind them, succeeded. The committee forthwith met in a side-chapel, and the famous Chalcedonian "Definition of Faith" was the result of their labours.

The first paragraph comes to this: "Tares are being ceaselessly sown amid the wheat of true doctrine; but Christ, in the present case, has provided a remedy in the assembling of this synod. We therefore reaffirm the Nicene 'exposition,' and what was defined by the 150 at Constantinople." But here comes a surprise. The Nicene Creed, as here given, is not the Nicene Creed as recited in the second session; it contains certain additions, as, "from the heavens," "of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary," "was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate," "and was buried," "according to the Scriptures," "and sitteth at the right hand of the Father," "and again with glory," "whose kingdom shall have no end," "the Lord, the life-giving;" while the words, "both things in heaven and things in earth," are omitted after "through whom all things were made." Yet the Creed stops after "life-giving;" and the Nicene anathemas follow, with the omission of "or created;" so that in this representation we have neither the one thing nor the other. Why, one asks, did not the framers of the Definition take care to present the true text on an occasion of such solemnity? To our minds the proceeding is strangely unbusinesslike; we can only suppose that local predilection prevailed over all sense of accuracy, and that the Constantinopolitans could not bear to omit these "Epiphanian" phrases which they had learned to prize as Constantinopolitan, even when they were professedly giving the Creed of 325 and were about to give what they regarded as the Second Council's form of the Creed—so that in the latter the words quoted above were repeated over again, with the addition of the clauses which in the Epiphanian form begin, "Who proceedeth from the Father," and end, "And a life of the age to come." Then the definition proceeds: "This wise and salutary symbol of the divine

grace should have been sufficient as teaching the complete truth as to the Trinity, and presenting (aright) the Incarnation of our Lord; but as some have denied the Virgin to be Theotocos, and others have introduced a fusion and a commixture, therefore the Council first decrees that the Creed of the 318 shall be inviolate, and then, in regard to the true faith concerning the Holy Spirit, it confirms the teaching of the 150; next, as against those who pretend that the Son of Mary was a mere man, it accepts the synodical letters of Cyril; and to these it has added the letter of Leo against Eutyches, inasmuch as " (observe the reason here given) "it agrees with the confession of the great Peter" (in Matt. xvi. 16). From some words in the above it might seem that the term "symbol" is used with reference only to the Creed of 325 as above given, and that the so-called Constantinopolitan form is treated only as a piece of "teaching," analogous to the letters of Cyril and Leo. And yet it is called a "symbol," and must surely be referred to when the "salutary symbol" is said to contain the "perfect truth as to the Father, the Son, *and the Holy Spirit*;" for the Creed of 325 had been felt to be inadequate as against the Macedonian heresy, and the "Epiphanian" additions were in great measure intended to supply what was thus lacking. The definition proceeds to condemn the idea of two Sons, of a passible divinity in Christ, of a fusion of His two natures, of a heavenly origin for "the form of a servant assumed by Him from us," and the special Monophysite proposition that "two natures existed before the union, but only one after it." The formula to which this leads up—the definition proper—affirms the oneness of Christ as Son of God, "perfect alike in Godhead and in Manhood the Selfsame, of a rational soul and a body, co-essential with the Father in Godhead, with us in Manhood: begotten before the ages of the Father as to Godhead, born of Mary the Virgin Theotocos as to Manhood: acknowledged (to exist) *in* two natures" (the Greek says "from" or "of," but this is clearly an error), "without confusion, change, division, or severance: the difference of the natures being in no wise abolished because of the union, but rather the perfection of each nature being preserved, and (both) concurring into one Person and one Hypostasis,"—this last point being emphasized by a repeated denial of a duality of Persons, and an acknowledgment of "one and the selfsame Son and only-begotten God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ." This statement will be seen to be largely based on the Formulary of Reunion: the important

sentence as to "the difference of the natures not being abolished" was substantially taken from Cyril's second letter to Nestorius. It went beyond Flavian's two confessions of faith in explicitness as to the human co-essentiality of Christ with *us*, *i.e.* with men at large, not merely with His Mother. The Ephesian prohibition of compiling any other creed or symbol was adopted at the close of the document with reference clearly to the "symbol" as above recited.

With the acts of the same session Hefele associates the address or letter sent by the Council to the Emperor on the doctrinal question, which ranks the Tome with other "explanations" of the Creed such as successive heresies have made necessary, and throws on those who object to it as "innovating" the *onus* of proving "that it is not in accordance with Scripture, that it is not in agreement with earlier Fathers, that it does not defend the Nicene Faith, that it does not overthrow the fancies of doctrinal innovations." The light in which the Council viewed the Tome, and the grounds on which it was adopted, could not be more lucidly shown than in this context, which of itself would suffice to show that the Tome was not regarded as intrinsically above discussion, nor accepted as the *ex cathedra* pronouncement of an infallible Pontiff on the principles of the Vatican Council of 1870.

CHAPTER XLIX.

THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.—PART II.

THE remaining sessions of the Council of Chalcedon are on the whole of much less interest. On the 25th of October Marcian and Pulcheria visited the Council in state, attended by the imperial and senatorial representatives and other high civil dignitaries. The Emperor explained that he "came not in order to make a display of power, but, after the example of Constantine, in order that the multitude might not be drawn into dissensions by the bad teachings of certain men." Aetius asked that the definition might be read to the sovereigns. "Read it," said Marcian. The reading was followed by greetings to Marcian as a "new Constantine," and even "a new Paul;" for "Byzantinism" had already fostered that "idolizing of kings" which our own Bishop Andrewes found reason to deprecate. Pulcheria was also saluted as a "new Helena." Marcian then proposed three regulations for adoption: that monks should be subject to their bishops, and should not meddle, unauthorised, in public affairs; that clerics and monks should not farm land nor be stewards of secular property; and that a cleric appointed by one church should not be transferred to another without necessity. The first of these provisions is illustrated by the disorderly violence of some Egyptian monks in the times of Theophilus and Cyril, and by cases in which clerics or monks in the reign of Arcadius had forcibly rescued criminals under sentence; the second recalls St. Cyprian's vivid picture of the relaxing effect of a "long peace" on the tone of African bishops and clergy. "I think it right," said the Emperor, in the tone of a good Churchman, "that these regulations should be enacted by canon in your synod, rather than by any law of mine." They were adopted accordingly, and rank as the fourth, third, and fifth canons of Chalcedon. Again the acclamations broke forth, "Many years to the Emperor!"

Marcian then announced that Chalcedon should have the titular status of a metropolis, saving all rights of Nicomedia as metropolitical in fact—this condition being put in as a safeguard against such contentions as had broken out between Photius and Eustathius. The bishops then begged Marcian to release them from further attendance: he answered that he knew they were weary, but requested them to wait a few days longer and gave them leave to raise any points they desired before the commissioners.

According to Evagrius, the main body of the Chalcedonian canons were passed in a session following immediately on the imperial visit; but he distinguishes it from the session next to be described, which is reckoned as the seventh, held on October 26. Its business was the ratification of a concordat between two leading bishops, Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem. In order to understand the dispute, we must remember that the Nicene Council had upheld the metropolitical position of Cæsarea in Palestine, reserving only a traditional honorary pre-eminence for Jerusalem among the suffragan churches. But the increase of pilgrimages to the "Holy City" and its adjacent sacred places had inspired Juvenal with a not unnatural desire to make his see, as truly "apostolical," supreme in Palestine; not content with the supersession of the see of Cæsarea, by which he had acquired metropolitical rights over his own province, he had encroached even on the jurisdiction of Antioch before the Ephesian Council, and (according to a letter of Leo to Maximus) had in that Council claimed to be primate over all Palestine—a claim which Cyril baffled, and against which he afterwards wrote to Leo, although for policy's sake he and Proclus continued to keep on terms with Juvenal. In the Latrocinian Council, Juvenal had taken his seat above Domnus, and Alypius, a Palestinian bishop, had called him his archbishop. The question had ultimately come before Marcian, who desired the commissioners to settle it. They had brought Maximus and Juvenal together; and Maximus, though reluctantly, had agreed that the see of Jerusalem should be supreme over the churches of the three provinces called the "first, second, and third Palestines." This was a smaller extent of jurisdiction than Juvenal had coveted; but he accepted what he could thus get, while Maximus took the first opportunity of complaining to Leo on the ground that the arrangement was a departure from the Nicene rulings. It certainly was so: the sixth Nicene canon had

expressly safeguarded the existing rights of the Church of Antioch : and Leo therefore professed to treat the innovation as null, but was unable to carry out his disapproval in fact. The saving clause by which, in one manuscript, Maximus makes his consent to the compromise depend on Leo's sanction, appears to be a Roman invention, for Leo's letter to Maximus contains no reference to it. The Council thus erected a patriarchate of Jerusalem with the formal assent of the Emperor.

Of all the prelates of the Antiochene patriarchate by far the most conspicuous was Theodoret. His position was anomalous : Leo had pronounced him to be worthy of reinstatement after his deposition in the Latrocinium ; the commissioners had introduced him into the Council, but as competent either to accuse or to be accused ; he was not, then, in the proper sense, a member of the Council, yet he had been allowed to vote on the question of faith. In the eighth session those bishops who were sensitive to any survival of Nestorianism demanded that he should anathematize Nestorius. It was what he had once declared that he would never do. He tried to fence with the question, and asked that a petition and a memorial of his might be read. This was met by a cry of "We will have no reading." Then he said that he had "always been orthodox, and that he rejected not only Nestorius and Eutyches, but every one who was not orthodox." This would not do : he was required to "speak plainly, to anathematize Nestorius, his teaching, and his friends"—of whom Theodoret himself had been one. He protested that he had not come thither for the sake of preserving his bishopric, but because he had been misrepresented : he again combined the two names under one anathema ; but this was thought to mar the effect of the special repudiation demanded. He tried to state his opinions at length : "I believe——" but a fierce shout interrupted him : "He's a Nestorian : turn out the heretic !" Then, at last, the cup of humiliation was drained ; he anathematized "Nestorius, and any one who did not call the holy Virgin Theotocos, or divided the Only-begotten into two Sons. I have signed the definition and the letter of Leo, and thus I think ; farewell !" The commissioners ruled that "all doubt respecting his orthodoxy was now at an end : let the synod vote his restoration, as Leo had already deemed right." Maximus professed to have long known, by experience of Theodoret's preaching, that he was "Catholic." It was resolved by acclamation that Theodoret was "worthy of the see." The incident deserves to be

remembered, as evidence that Leo's pronouncement in his favour was not regarded as decisive: a further requirement was pressed upon him, and he would not have been reinstated in default of compliance. Then other bishops were called upon to pronounce a similar anathema, and complied. The commissioners then gave a significant hint: "Since the Council's wishes have been in all respects met, it is time for all to cherish unanimity."

The tedious case of Ibas was next taken up. He said that he had been condemned in his absence at Ephesus, although the charges brought against him had already been disproved: he asked that the sentence should be cancelled. The minutes of the inquiry held at Tyre were read, and showed that he had cleared himself of heresy and had come to terms with his accusers. Photius and Eustathius, who had signed the document as judges, were asked whether they still adhered to it. They said that they did. The question was adjourned until the next day, when Ibas moved sympathy by telling how he had been confined in twenty different prisons: he was in one of them at Antioch when he heard of his deposition at Ephesus. But just when he seemed to be on the point of being reinstated, some strongly anti-Nestorian bishops pronounced the formula, "We object," adding that accusers were waiting to enter. They were admitted. Their spokesman, a deacon named Theophilus, asked for the reading of the minutes of the trial at Berytus—which was probably prior to that at Tyre. This record was consequently read, together with the series of charges then laid against Ibas, and his letter to Maris reflecting severely on Cyril. The commissioners asked to hear the proceedings at Ephesus against Ibas; but the Roman legates objected, on the ground that Leo had pronounced the acts of that synod to be valueless for purposes of accusation. The end of it was that Ibas was acquitted, but with a somewhat embarrassing diversity of language. Paschasinus, very unwarily, and Maximus following his lead, committed themselves to the proposition that the letter to Maris proved Ibas to be orthodox; Anatolius implied as much, saying that all that had been read—which included that letter—proved his innocence. On the other hand, Juvenal treated the "old man" as a convert from heresy, who as such might be treated with favour. Other prelates laid stress on his promise at Tyre to anathematize Nestorius; and the bishop of Nicomedia observed that "what he had wrongly said against the blessed Cyril had been refuted" by his later profession of orthodoxy. Still it was

only on condition of anathematizing Nestorius in their presence, and of adhering to the doctrinal decisions of the Council, that the bishops as a body were willing to recognise Ibas. He took the test in unequivocal language: "I have already, in writing, anathematized Nestorius: what one does once with full conviction one may do ten thousand times again;" and he anathematized "Nestorius himself, and Eutyches, and every one who owned 'one nature,' and who does not think as the holy synod itself thinks." But by refraining from condemning the letter to Maris, the Council bequeathed a difficulty to the future. Silence on such a point, on the part of such a body, did not necessarily prove that the letter was thought orthodox; but when Justinian dragged the Eastern Church, and through pope Vigilius the Western, into a profitless and mischievous controversy about the "Three Capitula" or "Articles," and then exacted from the Fifth General Council an anathema against the letter to Maris as heretical, the question inevitably arose—on that point, as on the "article" of the anti-Cyrrilline writings of Theodoret—"Does not such an anathema mean revolt from the authority of Chalcedon?" It might be said, on the one hand, "The Fathers at Chalcedon heard the letter read, had opportunity to express their judgment on it, and abstained from calling it heretical; and some of them, speaking individually, even treated it as orthodox;" and on the other, "The Council as a body did not approve it, and it is incompatible with the Definition; the favourable treatment accorded to Ibas only shows that his anathema against Nestorius, and his adhesion to the Council's doctrinal teaching, were somewhat indulgently set against whatever was objectionable in the letter; but that objectionable matter still remains." This view prevailed in the Council of 553, which took care to affirm that the letter "said to have been written by Ibas was thoroughly contradictory to the Chalcedonian definition." But such protestations did not satisfy those in the West who were sensitive about the honour of Chalcedon and of Leo; and the bishops of the Fourth Council would have been sufficiently perturbed if they could have known that their reticence, as a body, on the merits of the letter would be an element in an agitation destined to convulse the East, to humiliate a pope, and to produce a schism in Northern Italy that would last through the seventh century.

The next session, on the 29th of October, was occupied with a curious and very unedifying personal dispute. Bassian, the

ex-bishop of Ephesus, had complained to the Emperor about Stephen the present bishop, and had been referred by Marcian to the synod. His plea was this: As a presbyter, he had been highly esteemed, and had attracted the jealousy of Memnon, a former bishop, who, in order to get rid of him, actually forced him to receive consecration for the see of Evasa (a place which Le Quien could not identify), causing him—so he affirmed—to be beaten at the very altar from 9 a.m. until noon; certainly the grossest case on record of that extraordinary misconception which led ancient bishops, including Epiphanius, to think themselves justified in ordaining or consecrating men against their wills. Bassian had acted towards Evasa as Gregory had acted towards Sasima: he had never discharged episcopal functions there. Basil, the successor of Memnon, had practically acknowledged that Bassian had no moral bond to Evasa, and had treated him as a friend. At the next vacancy of the see of Ephesus, Bassian had been duly chosen to fill it, and had been recognised in that capacity by Theodosius II. and by Proclus of Constantinople. But after four years he was seized while celebrating the Eucharist, dragged out of the church, imprisoned, and plundered; while Stephen, who had long acted as one of his priests, was enthroned in his stead. Stephen replied to this effect: "Bassian had been translated, against Church law, from Evasa, and violence had accompanied his enthronement at Ephesus: he had there acted tyrannically, his expulsion had been just, and Stephen himself had been duly consecrated by forty suffragans of the primatial see." The feeling of the Council was favourable to Bassian, probably because Stephen had acted in the Latrocinium; but Olympius, whom Bassian claimed as one of his consecrators, declared that he had officiated under duress. The commissioners cut the knot by suggesting an expedient somewhat like that whereby the Council of Pisa, in 1409, set aside two competitor popes and appointed a new one. With considerable difficulty, and after directing attention to the sacred Gospel-book, they induced the Council to order a new election for Ephesus, due provision being made for the maintenance of Bassian and of Stephen. But the notion that this could take place at Chalcedon filled the suffragans of Ephesus with an alarm like that expressed by the Egyptians just twelve days before. "Have pity upon us!" they cried; "our children will be killed if the consecration takes place anywhere but at Ephesus!" One cannot take such apprehensions quite literally; but Greek passion might easily take the form of

zeal for local church-rights. The bishop of Magnesia affirmed that of all the twenty-seven successors of St. Timothy, only one, Basil, had been consecrated elsewhere than at Ephesus. On the other side, the bishop of Cyzicus scornfully said that there would have been no disturbance had consecration taken place at Constantinople: "at Ephesus they ordain mere *salad-eaters*" (low fellows). Constantinopolitan clerics insisted, in disorderly fashion, on their own church's privileges, and quoted precedents which might seem to give warning of a burning question at hand; and the commissioners thought it best to reserve the point for future consideration. The next business related to a dispute between Eunomius, the metropolitan bishop of Nicomedia, and Anastasius, bishop of Nicæa. Eunomius said in effect, "Anastasius has excommunicated certain clerics of Basilinopolis, who are under my jurisdiction; and Anatolius rebuked him for this act." Anastasius replied, "Basilinopolis, though a city, is acknowledged by its own municipal body to be a suburb of Nicæa. There are precedents for the consecration of its bishops, and the ordering of its church affairs, by my predecessors: its clerics had complained to me of their own bishop, and I referred them to Anatolius; but they went off to Eunomius, and he interfered." Eunomius questioned the statement as to consecrations for Basilinopolis. The fourth Nicene canon was read, assigning to metropolitans the confirmation of episcopal appointments within their provinces. "Yes," said Anastasius, "but I am a metropolitan: an imperial decree long ago recognised my city as a metropolis." Eunomius shattered this claim by pointing out that a later decree guaranteed Nicomedia against any loss of rights from the merely honorary *status* assigned to Nicæa. The commissioners added that the decrees in question referred merely to the cities, not at all to their bishoprics; and the Council resolved that the bishop of Nicæa had only an honorary dignity, whereas the bishop of Nicomedia was the actual metropolitan. The Constantinopolitan archdeacon struck in with a protest on behalf of the authority of the bishops of Constantinople in regard to consecrations for Basilinopolis; and the commissioners promised that such claims should be considered at the proper time.

The last day of October saw the fourteenth session, in which Sabinian, bishop of Perrha, complained that the Latrocinian Council had ousted him from his see and reinstated his deposed predecessor Athanasius. "What has Athanasius to say?" He said he could produce letters of sympathy from Cyril and Proclus.

He had consented to let certain charges against him be investigated by Domnus in synod, *if* he was willing to adhere to the line taken in those letters. "But," said Sabinian, "let the acts of that synod be read." It then appeared that Panolbius of Hierapolis, Athanasius's late metropolitan, had not, as Athanasius pretended, been prejudiced against him, but the reverse; that in fact Athanasius had declined to plead before him, had resigned his see and gone to live on his estate near Samosata, but had afterwards returned to Perrha and acted there as bishop, had told "false stories" to Cyril and Proclus, had ignored the citation of Domnus, and had thus obliged Domnus and the synod to depose him and to order a new appointment to Perrha. The record was supplemented by oral testimony from seven bishops who had sat in the synod; and it was decided that the deposition must, for the present, hold good, but that, as the synod had not thought it necessary to examine the charges against Athanasius, Maximus should do so in a new synod. What follows does credit to the commissioners, and, in a way, to the Council also. The former ruled that if any one great offence were proved against Athanasius, he should not only be deprived of the episcopate but be subjected to the penalties of public law: if, on the other hand, the charges were withdrawn or disproved, Maximus was to reinstate him at Perrha, upholding Sabinian at the same time in episcopal dignity and assigning to him a stipend from the revenues of that church. "Nothing can be more just," said Maximus, and the whole Council echoed his words. The lay magistrates had once more given to the prelates a lesson of patient and discriminating fairness; and it is interesting to observe that the Council implicitly approved of the principle that crimes—as distinct from spiritual offences—proved against bishops should be punished by secular tribunals, and thus made no demand for clerical "immunity."

And now, at last, we come to *paulo majora*. The final scene of the Council is memorable enough. It had been understood, twice over, at the end of the eleventh and thirteenth sessions, that the question of the rights of the Constantinopolitan see, in regard to churches of the "Asian diocese," should come up in due time for settlement. The time, in the opinion of the Constantinopolitan clerics, was now come; and we may presume that they were acting with the full sanction of their bishop when they asked the Roman legates to take part in the proposed discussion. What was the reply? That "they had received no instructions

to that effect." It appeared next day, on their own showing, that they *had* received precise written instructions to "resist any attempt, on the part of persons who might presume on the grandeur of their cities, to alter what had been laid down by the Fathers." Their excuse, therefore, for not staying was a quibble. They had been ordered to prevent, as far as they could, a certain thing from being done; they had had distinct warning that it was proposed to do it; and their mode of obeying the order given them was to go away when the "attempt" to be made was imminent, obviously because they did not choose to be outvoted. When they had left the church, Aetius referred the point to the commissioners; but they also withdrew, directing the Council to "look into the matter," and wishing, perhaps, to avoid the appearance of controlling its action in a matter in which their own close connexion with Constantinople might be supposed to give them a special interest. The prelates thus left to themselves were but 192 in number, for many had left Chalcedon since the definition had received the assent of 350; but still they were legally "the synod," and they at once proceeded to consider a new draft canon, the import of which will be understood by remembering that the Council of Constantinople in 381 had in its third canon assigned to the bishop of Constantinople a "precedency of honour" next after the bishop of Rome, "because Constantinople was New Rome."

This enactment, which Rome had ignored as illegitimate, and which Alexandria naturally disliked, conferred no scrap of new authority or jurisdiction on Constantinople, and did not even, technically, affect the relation of the Constantinopolitan see to that of Heraclea as its metropolitan and as primatial for the Thracian "diocese." But in the interval between 381 and 451 events had built up for the see of the Eastern capital a large fabric of informal authority. In the quaint phrase of Le Quien, the author of "*Oriens Christianus*," the bishops of Constantinople from the beginning of the fifth century onwards had "begun to nibble at the three 'dioceses' of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus"—the first step in the process being taken in Chrysostom's time, when, supported by prelates who (as we have seen) were "sojourning" at Constantinople and had formed a sort of consultative committee presided over by its bishop, he accepted an invitation from Proconsular Asia to correct abuses in the church of Ephesus, over which, in strictness, he had no authority at all. The case was

such as in those days was held to warrant an appeal to, and intervention on the part of, the most accessible and influential holders of that "one episcopate" in which, as St. Cyprian worded it, each bishop had an entire interest "like that of shareholder in some joint property"—so Archbishop Benson aptly renders "*cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*". So too Atticus of Constantinople had assumed the character of primate for Thrace, and had, for a time, procured the sanction of Theodosius for his exercise of jurisdiction over the churches of Eastern Illyricum. These, however, the Roman see took effective measures for retaining within its own patriarchate: and Honorius, stirred up by pope Boniface, persuaded his nephew to recall the edict in favour of Atticus. The latter thereupon "turned his attention," as Neale puts it, to the "Asiatic" and Pontic "dioceses," and obtained from Theodosius II. a law rendering the consent of the bishop of Constantinople necessary for the appointment of their bishops. Out of this grew up a custom of resorting to Constantinople for consecration, since bishops-elect, feeling that to stand well with the bishop of Constantinople was for their interest, easily persuaded themselves that such a practice was but appropriate in view of the "honorary precedency;" and Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus, had consecrated a metropolitan for the Hellespontine province. The Council of Ephesus, which was naturally biassed against the see of Constantinople, had kept its eye upon these advances or aggressions, which can hardly have been absent from the minds of Cyril and his brethren when they furnished their decree on the question between Antioch and Cyprus with a significant reference to the possible intrusion of "the arrogance of secular authority under the pretext of episcopal action." That the bishops of Constantinople were free from ambitious motives in this extension of their power is more than any observer of human nature would assert: they were just as open to that temptation as the bishops of Rome during the development of the Papacy: and ambition is never more truly ambition than when it works under an ecclesiastical disguise.

At Chalcedon, naturally, the influence of the Constantinopolitan church was, not indeed all-powerful, but still considerable; and the Council, as a council, had already gone a long way in the direction indicated by Aetius, inasmuch as by its ninth and seventeenth canons it had enacted that complaints against a metropolitan within the Asian and Pontic "dioceses"—in a word, within Asia

Minor—might be brought either before the primates or “exarchs” of those dioceses, or before the “throne” or see of Constantinople; and thus matters might seem already ripe for the formal erection of a Constantinopolitan patriarchate. Such an act, it might be argued, would simply be the recognition of a state of facts which had grown up with high authority in its favour and with a general amount of acquiescence during the past seventy years.

Now let us look at the canon as first drafted and passed. It referred to the canon of 381, and explained it by saying that, as “the Fathers”—meaning the church authorities of an earlier time—“had awarded the precedence” (or “the first place”) to the see of Old Rome, *because* its city was imperial, so the “150” at Constantinople, from a similar motive, “had assigned an equal precedence to the see of New Rome, reasonably judging that the city which was (now) imperial, and enjoyed the same precedence with the imperial Old Rome, should in ecclesiastical matters also be magnified like her, and rank second after her.” What, then, was the ecclesiastical “precedence” which had thus been assigned to the see of Constantinople? The canon of 381, as we have seen, had described it as “honorary;” and if it was “equal” to those which had been awarded to the see of Old Rome, it would follow that the distinction attaching from an earlier time to the see of Rome itself was a precedence, or, in the phrase commonly used by our Anglican divines, a “primacy of honour”—*not* a supremacy. The ground of this “privilege” or “primacy of honour” is stated to be the civil dignity of the city of Rome as the ancient capital of the empire. And this was, in fact, its original ground, and a most natural one too. It was inevitable that a church which was seated at the central point of the Roman world, and associated in the minds of all Christians with “*the city*” of cities, and habitually resorted to, as Irenæus says, by Christian visitors from all quarters, should loom largest among Christian communities, should easily acquire a representative position, and withal by degrees an undefined leadership; and it is well to bear in mind that at first—*e.g.* in the days of St. Clement—it is distinctly the Roman Church, rather than its chief pastors as such, that stands forth as holding the “precedence” in question and the influence attaching to it. But doubtless there were other and subordinate causes contributing to the same result. There was the memory of St. Peter and St. Paul, as having taught and suffered martyrdom at Rome, and as naturally supposed to have organized the

Roman Church and in that sense "founded" its episcopate—a supposition prior to that which in the third century assumed that Peter himself had been Rome's first bishop. There was the moral claim suggested by the conspicuous earnestness and far-reaching bountifulness of the well-to-do Roman Church-people, by the good lives of primitive Roman bishops, and by the Roman Church's general reputation, if not for theological learning, yet for orthodoxy. But when all this is duly allowed for, we come back to the same point: if the names of Peter and Paul had been similarly connected with some other locality—if the church that owed so much to them, and that had so many merits of its own, had been seated, let us say, at Athens or Thessalonica, or even at Alexandria or at Antioch—that church could never have stood towards other churches in the relation which made the Roman Church what, in fact, it was, long before it asserted a "supremacy."

But now for the second part of the canon. The wording is here specially important. "*And so that* the metropolitans alone" (as distinct from the ordinary bishops) "of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian 'dioceses,' and moreover such bishops of those dioceses as dwell in territories inhabited by barbarians, should be ordained by the holy see of the holy church of Constantinople: it being understood that each metropolitan of those 'dioceses,' in conjunction with the bishops of his province, is to ordain bishops for that province, according to the canons; but, as has been said, these metropolitans themselves are to be ordained by the archbishop of Constantinople, after their election has been unanimously agreed upon and reported to him." First observe the "and so that." It is a clever and unostentatious way of slurring over the difference between an honorary precedence and a patriarchal jurisdiction, of gliding smoothly from one to the other, of suggesting that what is now to be enacted is, after all, only what was implied in the previously cited canon of Constantinople,—whereas clearly it was a distinct advance beyond it.

So much for the canon as passed on October 31, in the fifteenth session of the Council. The chief episcopal names attached to it are those of Anatolius, Maximus, Juvenal, Cyriacus metropolitan of Heraclea (as represented in his absence by another bishop), the metropolitans Diogenes of Cyzicus, Florentius of Sardis, Basil of Seleucia, Photius of Tyre, Onesiphorus of Iconium, Seleucus of

Amasia, Stephen of Hierapolis, Nunechius of Laodicea: among the ordinary bishops are Eusebius of Dorylæum, Sabinian of Perrha, and Theodoret. One bishop takes upon him to sign for four absent bishops as well as in his own person, another for six, another for five, another even for twelve: in two cases a presbyter signs as proxy for his own bishop.

Next day the commissioners and the Roman legates reappeared, and the sixteenth session exhibited a dramatic scene. Paschasinus addressed the commissioners, to the effect that, on the preceding day, after he and his colleagues and "their Excellencies" had withdrawn, "some proceedings were said to have taken place which appeared to be contrary to the canons and to discipline." He requested that the record of them might be read. "If," said the commissioners, "any acts were done after our departure, let them be read." Aetius interposed with an explanation. The question of doctrine had been properly settled; but it was usual in synods, after the main business had been put into due form, to examine and formulate other necessary matters. It was well known beforehand that the Church of Constantinople had some business to bring forward for settlement: the bishops from Rome were asked to take part, but declined: "your Magnificences, on being referred to, ordered the Council to consider it." The bishops had accordingly taken it up as a matter of common interest, and desired what was done to be done: and here it is—"a thing done not clandestinely or fraudulently, but regularly and in due order." The canon was read: Lucentius, one of the legates, assuming that the signatures had been obtained by coercion, asserted this, of which he could have no cognisance, as a fact: whereupon the bishops exclaimed, "No one was coerced!" Lucentius then objected that the Nicene canons had been superseded, in this new resolution, by those of "the 150," which were not in the synodical collection; and he added a dilemma: If the Constantinopolitans during some eighty years have "enjoyed the benefit" which the proposed canons would secure, "what do they want now? if they have never enjoyed it, why do they ask for it?" This dilemma sounded pithy, but it might have been met by saying that it was desirable to legalise what had been enjoyed without synodical warrant: Aetius, however, was content to ask what instructions on the matter in hand had been given to the legates, whereupon the order already quoted was produced. The commissioners then ordered that each side should bring forward the canons on which

it relied. Paschasinus then read the sixth Nicene canon in the form at that time current in Italy and Sicily, beginning, "The Church of Rome has always had the first place (*primatum*): therefore let Egypt also have it" (*i.e.* within the Egyptian limits), "so that the bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all, since this is also customary for the Roman bishop; and similarly let him who is appointed (bishop) in Antioch: and in the other provinces let the churches of the larger cities have the first places (*primatus*)." He also read the seventh Nicene as to the relation of the bishop of "Ælia" to the metropolitan of Cæsarea—which would have been more to the purpose if adduced in arrest of the concordat between Maximus and Juvenal.

This version of the sixth Nicene canon is not supported either by the Greek text, or by the Gallic and African Latin versions, or by the later Roman version of Dionysius Exiguus; but, even as it stands, it says nothing about a universal Roman *primatus*. It uses *primatus* for a patriarchal or quasi-patriarchal jurisdiction. At the same time, the first sentence reads like an insertion by some dependent of Rome, who did not see that the primary object of the canon was to secure the authority of the *Alexandrian* see, and that the Roman was only mentioned by way of illustration and precedent. Another curious point in this version is that by introducing the adjective *ampliorum* for the greater cities, it favoured the very pretensions which the delegates had been instructed to resist. The version agrees with the rendering in a version called "Antiquissima," which is found in a ninth-century manuscript written for an Italian bishop named Ingilram, and it is probable enough that Paschasinus's reading was current in Italy and Sicily for some time before the Council of Chalcedon; but it remains an Italian-Sicilian reading still, with no independent authority.

After Paschasinus had finished, Aetius, according to the printed editions of the Conciliar acts, caused an imperial secretary to read the sixth Nicene canon from the Greek text. Some Roman controversialists question this, because the Nicene canon would not serve the purpose of Constantinople. But they forget that if Aetius had allowed a corrupt rendering of that canon to pass without comment, he would have damaged the authority of the Greek text, of which his church was the careful guardian, and therewith his own case also. He followed it up with the first, second, and third canons of the Council of 381. The commissioners then called upon the "Asian" and Pontic bishops to

say whether they had signed the new canon voluntarily or under any constraint. Thirteen of them spoke in turn. "Before God, I signed freely." "I was not constrained." "I am glad to be under the see of Constantinople; it seems to me just." "Three of my predecessors were consecrated by this see: I found the custom in force and followed it: and I have now acted freely." "The glory of the Church of Constantinople is our glory: for we too share in the honour that comes from it, and it takes upon itself our anxieties." These and other speakers were themselves metropolitans. Eusebius of Dorylæum said that he had read the canon of 381 to Leo at Rome in the presence of Constantinopolitan clerics, and that Leo had approved of it: this must have been a mistake on the part of the very impetuous speaker. But some bishops of the two "dioceses" had not signed the new canon: they were asked accordingly to say what they thought. Eusebius, the metropolitan of Ancyra, taking care to say that he spoke only for himself, said that there were cases in which his predecessors had consecrated metropolitans: he himself, in one case, had so acted under direction from Constantinople: he had more than once said that he had no personal wish to consecrate in such cases, and he repeated it now: all that he really cared about was that the practice of taking fees for consecration at Constantinople might be abolished. "It has been abolished," said one of the Constantinopolitans, "both by laws and canons." Eusebius rejoined, "Thanks to God, Anatolius's reputation is excellent; *but no man is immortal.*" "Who consecrated you?" asked Anatolius. "Proclus," he answered. The primate of Cappadocian Cæsarea only said that they would confer with Anatolius and arrange the matter.

At last the commissioners gave their decision. It was clear, they said, from what had passed, that "the first place before all others, and the principal honour" (*i.e.* the absolute precedency in rank) "must, according to the canons, be preserved to the archbishop of Old Rome; but that the archbishop of imperial Constantinople, New Rome, ought to enjoy the same privileges of honour, *and* full authority to consecrate the metropolitans in the Asian, Thracian, and Pontic 'dioceses,' in the following manner: The clergy, land-owners, and illustrious men, and all or the majority of the bishops of the province, shall vote and choose whom they think worthy to be metropolitan, and report accordingly to the archbishop of Constantinople; it shall then be in his discretion either to send for the elect and consecrate him, or to permit him to be made

bishop within the province : but the bishops of the several cities shall be consecrated by the majority of the comprovincial bishops, the metropolitans possessing, according to the established rule, the confirmatory authority, and the archbishop of Constantinople taking no part in such consecrations."

One sees at once how this recension was proposed as an improvement on the original draft. The electoral rights of the province were emphasised ; a hint was given to the bishop of Constantinople that it might often be desirable that metropolitans should be consecrated within their provinces ; and a special *caveat* secured the consecrations of ordinary bishops from any interference on the part of Constantinople. The commissioners put the canon in its new form to the Council ; it was approved by acclamation. "This is a just decision. So say we all. This pleases us all. Let what has now been formulated hold good." Then came entreaties for dismissal : "We pray you, let us depart. We all agree in the decision." Lucentius intervened : "The apostolic see ought not to be humiliated in our presence : we therefore request your Excellencies that whatever was done yesterday, in our absence, to the prejudice of the canons, may be cancelled ; if not, let our opposition to it be entered on the minutes, that we may know what to report to the apostolic man, the pope of the universal Church, so that he may be able to give his judgment either as to the injury done to his own see or as to the violation of the canons." The commissioners ignored this demand, and simply observed, "Our interlocutory sentence has been approved by the whole synod."

So ended the last session. A letter, however, was sent to Leo in the name of the Council, which combined in truly Greek fashion fluent obsequiousness with diplomatic *finesse*. He was addressed as "head" and "president of the synod," as "the divinely appointed guardian of the Vine," as "having (by his Tome) originated a benefit to the Church : " he was asked to "confirm" what had been done by the Council ; and it was presumed that his legates' resistance to the last canon must have been due to their wish that this advantage to Constantinople should proceed from his own forethought. This was a little too strong to be passed off on such a man as Leo ; and Anatolius, in a personal letter written soon afterwards, modified it by saying, "Your legates, not knowing your real mind, disturbed the synod, and grossly insulted myself and the Church of Constantinople." Marcian wrote still more

plainly: "They vehemently endeavoured to prevent the synod from enacting anything concerning that church." Leo was not to be propitiated. His legates had intimated that he might ground the refusal of his assent either on wrong done to his own see or on the infringement of Nicene law. He was prudent enough, in dealing with Easterns, to choose the latter course. His real grievance, doubtless, consisted in the reason given by the canon for the precedence "awarded by the Fathers" to his own see, and in the accession of dignity and power which might make that of Constantinople a dangerous rival. But in the letters in which he attacks the canon, although he is copious enough in the use of such terms as "ambition" and "presumption," "self-exaltation" and "intemperate cupidity," to an extent which recalls the proverb about glass houses—and although in reckless fashion he assumes that, all disclaimers notwithstanding, the bishops' assent had practically been forced—still he fights behind the breastwork of zeal for Nicene authority, and takes up the utterly untenable ground that *all* the decisions of the First Council were alike divine and inviolable, so that no change of circumstances could, to the end of time, warrant the slightest alteration of even its external and disciplinary arrangements. His persistency at last prevailed, first with Marcian and then, through Marcian, with Anatolius. The latter had the meanness to throw the responsibility for the obnoxious canon on his own clerics; and Leo, who of course saw through this paltry excuse, answered in effect, "If you regret it, well and good: let us be friends." But although a sort of reconciliation was thus, after some three years, patched up, and Greek collectors of canons omitted the one on which Constantinople for a time had ceased to insist, still the Pope's success was rather formal than real: as Liberatus said about 560, "What the synod established still remains by the support of the Emperor:" the see of Constantinople retained not only the precedence assigned to it in 381, but the patriarchal jurisdiction created for it in 451: and the Council "in Trullo," although without the assent of Rome, reaffirmed both the canons in question.

To us the Fourth Council is chiefly interesting as having fixed the lines of catholic thought and teaching on the great Christological question which had so long occupied the mind of the Church. Doubtless it did not command universal acquiescence. Egypt passionately rejected its doctrinal affirmations as antagonistic, in the Monophysite view, to those of Ephesus. The orthodox prelate

who was placed in the vacated chair of Dioscorus was harassed by fierce hostility, and ultimately died a martyr's death: the adherents of Chalcedon were called "Kingsmen" in Egypt, and "Synodites" by the Monophysites of Syria: the political necessity, as it seemed, of conciliating these malcontent forces misled Justinian into the senseless policy of procuring a *post-mortem* condemnation, not only of Theodore, but of Theodoret's anti-Cyrrilline writings and of Ibas's letter to Maris: and in the next century one of his successors was persuaded to think that the maintainers of "one nature" (Monophysites) might be reunited to the recognised Church, and religious unity secured in perilous times for his empire, by the assertion of "one will" in the Christ—thus precipitating a controversy which was closed in 680 by the pronouncements of that Sixth (Ecumenical) Council, which, by affirming two concordant "wills and activities" in the single person of the Saviour, carried on and completed the work of the Fourth. The Definition has been criticised as not explaining *how* the unity of person and the duality of natures can coexist as elements in the Incarnation of our Lord. Perhaps a theological formula is none the worse for exhibiting somewhat of that modest self-restraint in which theologians have sometimes been found wanting. There are many points as to which we have no warrant for asking "how," still less for attempting an answer. And if it is thought that the necessary unity of the Incarnate Christ is obscured by supposing Him, in the terms of the Definition, to exist "in" two distinct spheres of life and action, "inseparable" yet "unconfused," and that it needs to be safeguarded by the idea of a *literal* "communication of properties" between the two natures, such as would practically mould them into one or fuse one in the other, this is the old Monophysite objection, although it may be urged in support of what amounts to a Monophysitism inverted, according to which it is not the Manhood which gives way, wholly or partially, to the Godhead, but the Godhead which gives way to the Manhood by the temporary abandonment of certain so-called divine "attributes"—which in truth are plural only in an "economic" sense, as modes of representing, in human thought and speech, so many aspects of that indivisible perfection which makes up the divine essence, and *is* God. After all, if Christ is believed in as One, yet as both truly God and truly Man—however little we can comprehend the relation thus created—that belief is all that the Chalcedonian terminology implies: to hold it is to be at one with the Fourth Council.

INDEX

A

Aberius, an Armenian priest, ii. 390
 Abgar, king of Edessa, 201
 Ablavius of Edessa, ii. 440
 —. *See* Ælafius
 Abraham, his well at Mamre, 124; 359; ii. 476
 —, a priest of Constantinople, ii. 451-453
 Abundantius, bishop of Trent, 442
 Abyssinia, 215
 Acacius, bishop of Amida, ii. 245
 —, bishop of Bercea, 405, 425, 454; ii. 39, 49, 65-69, 78, 92, 196, 241, 287, 292, 344, 350, 351, 353, 360-363, 365, 366
 —, bishop of Cæsarea, 170, 181, 185, 249, 258, 270, 273, 274, 280, 282, 292, 342, 353
 —, bishop of Melitene, ii. 241, 313, 314, 319, 322, 343, 345, 380, 390, 393
 —, a count, 124, 141
 Acepsimus, a Persian bishop, 205
 Acesius, Novatian bishop of Byzantium, 80, 108
 Achaia, 333, 454
 Achetas, a priest of Alexandria, 242
 Achilles, bishop of Alexandria, 53, 55, 116
 —, an adherent of Arius, 61
 Achitas, a deacon, 196
 Acolyths, at Nicea, 78; ii. 216
 Adai, 201
 Adam, ii. 167, 174, 180, 181, 216, 221, 476
 Adamnan, 121, 122; ii. 415
 Adelfius, British bishop, 28
 Adelphius, a Messalian, 523
 —, bishop of Cucusus, ii. 91
 Adeodatus, 499, 500; ii. 111
 Adonis, 318
 —, a river in Lebanon, 125
 Adoptionism, ii. 268
 Advent, ii. 475
 Advocates, ii. 133, 448
 Ædesius, a priest, 215
 —, a neoplatonist, 297
 Ælafius (Ablavius), vicarius of Africa, 25
 Ælia (Jerusalem), 62; ii. 546
 Ælianus, proconsul in Africa, 23, 25, 206

Æmilian, martyr under Julian, 311
 Æmilius, bishop of Beneventum, ii. 98
 Æni, 191
 Aerians (Aerius), 524
 Ætherichus, bishop of Smyrna, ii. 483
 Aetius, general, ii. 304, 404, 420
 —, notary and archdeacon of Constantinople, ii. 459, 467-469, 514, 522, 527, 533, 542, 545, 546
 —, Arian, 245, 250, 258, 259, 262, 278, 280, 283, 287, 300, 342
 —, bishop of Lydda, 140
 Afra, martyr at Augsburg, 11
 African Christians, intemperate zeal of, 15, 33; factiousness of, 540; bishops at Arles, 27; at Ariminum, 268; bishoprics numerous, ii. 147
 Agag, ii. 491
 Agapæ, 37; ii. 6
 Agape and her companions, martyrs, 12
 —, a Spanish lady, 423
 Agapetus, bishop of Synnada, ii. 141
 Agapius, a Palestinian martyr, 10
 —, Arian bishop of Ephesus, 521
 Agelius, Novatian bishop of Constantinople, 356, 357, 456, 457
 Agen in Gaul, 397
 Agnes, St., virgin and martyr, 11, ii. 177; her church at Rome, 127, 363
 Agonistici (Circumcellions), 211
 Agræcius, bishop of Treves, 27
 Agricola, a British Pelagian, ii. 234
 Agrippa, suburb at Antioch named after, 504
 Agrippina (Cologne), 395
 Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, 212; ii. 397
 Aitallaha, bishop of Edessa, 79
 Aithales, a priest and adherent of Arius, 61
 Aix, ii. 186, 419
 Aizan, an Ethiopian prince, 216, 242
Akoimetai, community of monks at Constantinople, ii. 239, 244
 Alamanni, 307
 Alans, ii. 179
 Alaric the Goth, ii. 3, 118, 119, 134, 136-139, 166

- Alban, St., British martyr, 11
 Albigensianism, 510
 Albina, a Roman lady, 169
 —, a correspondent of St. Augustine, ii. 215
 Albinus, a Roman noble, 481
Alciphron of Bishop Berkeley, 299
 Aleluid (Dunbarton), ii. 415
 Aleppo (Berœa), ii. 241
 Alexander the Great, 203
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 53; opened career to St. Athanasius, 56; blamed for indecision, 57; extant letters, 62, 66, 67, 68; deposed George, 65; at Nicea, 78, 94; baptismal creed, 88; death, 114; stories about, 118; ordained George of Arethusa priest, 141; deposed Euzoius, 293
 —, bishop of Antiaradus, ii. 491
 —, bishop of Antioch, 329; ii. 196–198, 331, 430
 —, bishop of Apamea, ii. 316, 344
 —, bishop of Byzantium, 67, 79, 159, 161
 —, bishop of Corinth, ii. 101
 —, bishop of Hierapolis, ii. 242, 316, 326, 344, 355, 356, 361, 363–367, 376–379, 434
 —, bishop of Jerusalem, 121; ii. 9
 —, bishop of Thessalonica, 79, 148, 151
 —, an abbot of Constantinople, ii. 239, 244
 —, a cleric of North Italy, ii. 23
 —, archbishop (of Armagh), ii. 394
 —, church of, at Alexandria, ii. 194
 Alexandria, agapæ at, 37; clergy of, 67; Easter determined at, 102; authority of bishop, 104; traditions as to election of bishop, 117–119; possessions of St. Peter's, Rome, at, 127; St. Anthony at, 133; letter to Constantine from, 160; episcopate of Gregory at, 168; letter from Sardica received at, 189; priests and deacons of, exiled, 191; paganism at, 308; chronicle of events at, 310; council of 362...139, 323–328; relation to Constantinople, 410; Jerome at, 481; monks near, 540; difference with Rome, ii. 145; Cyril's council at, ii. 293; parabolani of, ii. 195, 479, 480; churches at, *see* under Churches
 —, bishops of (*see* also under each name): Demetrius, 118; Heraclas, 231...118; Dionysius the Great, 247...118; [Maximus]; Theonas, 56; Peter, martyred 311...53; Achillas, bishop in 312...53; Alexander, 312 or 313...53; Athanasius, 326 (328)...114; [Arians: Pistus, 339...165; Gregory, 340...167; George, 356...241; Lucius, 362...321]; Peter, 373...376; Timothy, 381...416; Theophilus, 385...528; Cyril, 412...ii. 190; Dioscorus, 444...ii. 424, 428
 Alfius Cæcilianus, a duumvir of Aptunga, 23, 24
 Alfred, King, 163
 Algiers, ii. 248
 Aliscamps, the cemetery at Arles, 26
 Alleluia victory, ii. 234
 Alphæus, Nestorian bishop, ii. 359
 Altars, wooden, 335; ii. 113
 Alypius, bishop of Thagaste, 448, 494, 498, 499, 500; ii. 111, 119, 148, 222, 249
 —, a priest of Constantinople, ii. 239, 341
 —, a general, 316
 —, a Palestinian bishop, ii. 534
 Amachius, a governor, 311
 Amalek, ii. 62
 Amandus, bishop of Bordeaux, ii. 124
 Amasea (Amasia), 34; ii. 450
 Amator, bishop of Auxerre, ii. 246
 Ambitaurus, bishop of Reims, 27
 Ambrose, St., on number of Nicene bishops, 77; on homoousion, 91; on the true cross, 122, 123; association with Treves, 155, 395, 501; bishop of Milan, 180; on churches at Milan, 228; on Ariminum, 276; on election of Damasus, 362; on causes of prelates, 364; consecration, 385; on Gratian, 394; 397; treatise "De Fide," 402, 403; Maximus the Cynic, 414; "On the Holy Spirit," 416, 441; on St. Gregory Naz., 421; at Aquileia, 441; 451; at Rome, 454; Justina, 462, 483; Maximus, 462, 463; Valentinian, 462; 473–475, 536; hymns, 492, ii. 288, 356; against Auxentius, 495; Theodosius, 504, 508, 509, 516–519, ii. 192; discourse after death of Theodosius, ii. 1, 2; the representative prelate of his time, 4; interceding for criminals, 11, 13; close of episcopate, 13–16; letter to Vercellæ, 14; style as commentator, 16; on ministerial duties, 16; commentary on Psalms, 17; death of, 17; estimate of, 18; 19, 26, 43; case of Gerontius, 45; 124, 246; against Apollinarianism, 260; 411; cited as an authority, 176, 223, 322, 348, 389, 520
 Amida, 270; ii. 245
 Amiens, 394, 399; ii. 20
 Ammianus Marcellinus, 163, 191, 281, 303, 307, 310, 317, 318, 339, 340, 348, 349, 356, 361–363, 395, 472, 529; ii. 90
 Ammon, an Arian, 168
 Ammonius, bearer of a letter from Arius, 62
 —, bishop of Pisidian Laodicea, ii. 78
 —, an Egyptian monk, one of the Tall Brothers, 169; ii. 55, 56, 64, 72
 — Thaumasius, a Nitrian monk, ii. 194
 —, a pagan priest, 531
 Amon, Egyptian hermit, 243
 Ampelius, confessor in Africa, 13
 Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium, 391, 425, 440, 455, 459, 542; ii. 258, 322

Amphion, bishop of Nicomedia, 120
 Ananias, priest in Persia, 204
 Anaplis, near Constantinople, ii. 74
 Anastasia, baths at Constantinople, 356 ;
 house and church at Constantinople, 410-
 412 ; ii. 69
 Anastasius, bishop of Nicæa, ii. 539
 — I., pope, ii. 26, 39, 54, 55, 82, 107,
 109, 118, 161, 162
 —, priest and friend of Nestorius, ii. 262,
 275, 280, 300
 Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 495,
 498, 503, 505, 506, 512, 518, 522, 524,
 528, 529, 536, 539, 544, 547, 548
 —, bishop of Laodicea, 101, 102 ; ii. 19
 —, patrician and friend of Theodoret, ii.
 438, 500
 Anaunia, near Trent, ii. 23
 Anazarbus, 65, 250 ; ii. 241, 365, 377
 Ancoratus of Epiphanius, 434 ; ii. 64
 Ancyra, council of, 34-37, 76 ; Arian out-
 rages, 176, 183 ; Photinus born at, 193 ;
 council in year 358...259 ; Valens at,
 371 ; Arian meeting at, 378 ; ii. 102,
 319, 354. *See* Basil, Marcellus
 Andrew, bishop of Samosata, ii. 244, 308,
 309, 355, 359, 364, 366, 376-378
 —, a deacon of Constantinople, ii. 448,
 451, 468
 —, St., 476 ; ii. 127
 Andrewes, bishop, ii. 533
 Andronicus, governor of Berenice, ii. 143,
 144
 Anemius, bishop of Sirmium, 442, 454
 Angarum (Sangarum) in Bithynia, 521
 Anglo-Saxon canons, 535
 Angoulême, duchess of, ii. 236
 Anianus, semi-Arian bishop of Antioch, 274
 Anicetus, pope, 100
 Anicia Proba, Roman lady, 361
 Anician house, of Rome, 295, 361, 471 ; ii.
 177, 178
 Anna, 124
 Annianus, bishop of Alexandria, 55
 Anomæan Arianism, 250, 278, 281, 286,
 293, 357, 521 ; ii. 30
 Anselm, St., ii. 18
 Antaradus, ii. 491
 Anthedon, 308
 Anthemius, prætorian prefect, ii. 140, 236
 Anthinus, bishop of Nicomedia and martyr,
 63
 —, bishop of Tyana, 390 ; ii. 528
 Anthropomorphites, 542 ; ii. 50-53, 62
 Antidosis, ii. 474
 Antigonus, 76
 Antinous, in the Thebaid, 375
 Antioch, in Caria, 360
 —, in Syria, persecution at, 10 ; George,
 presbyter of, 65, 104 ; possessions of St.
 Peter's, Rome, at, 127 ; the Dedication
 Council, 172 ; council in year 269...91 ;
 in the sixth Nicene Canon, 104, 107 ;

church at, 125 ; 139, 140 ; Antiochene
 schism, 140, 324, 404, 424, 427-429, 460,
 525 ; palace of Constantius, 180 ; St.
 Athanasius at, 197 ; council in year 358
 ...258 ; trial of Eunomius at, 288 ; new
 city, 293 ; temple site at, 309 ; Julian
 and, 317 ; 320, 374, 404 ; Theodosius and,
 504-507 ; description of, 504 ; schism, ii.
 39, 196, 241 ; under bishop Porphyrius,
 ii. 93 ; difference with Rome, 145 ; and
 Cyprus, 62, 331, 332 ; birthplace of Theo-
 doret, 242 ; fourth canon of, 348 ; and
 Jerusalem, 534 ; 536
 Antioch, in Syria, bishops of (see also under
 each name) : Vitalis, bishop before 314
 ...34 ; Philogonius, before 321...68 ; Eu-
 stathius before 325...78 [Eustathians :
 Paulinus, 362...329 ; Evagrius, c. 389-
 393...525-527] ; Paulinus ? 330...141 ;
 Eulalius, 330...141 ; Euphronius, 331...
 141 ; Flacillus, c. 333...141 ; Stephen, c.
 342...181 ; Leontius, 344...192 ; Eu-
 doxius, 357...257 [Anianus, 359...274] ;
 Meletius, 360...290 [Arians : Euzoius,
 361...293 ; Dorotheus, before 380...404] ;
 Flavian, 381...428 ; Porphyrius, 404...ii.
 93 ; Alexander, 413...ii. 196 ; Theodotus,
 c. 420...ii. 241 ; John, 428...ii. 287 ;
 Domnus II., 441...ii. 422 ; Maximus, 494
 ...ii. 492
 Antiochus, bishop of Ptolemais, ii. 49, 65, 66,
 68, 75, 78, 79
 —, a messenger from Nestorius, ii. 285
 —, nephew of Eusebius of Samosata, 378
 —, a prefect, ii. 354
 — III., the Great, 293, 504
 — IV., Epiphanes, 504
 Antiphon for St. Augustine's eve, ii. 307
 Antiphonal chanting, 198
 Antiquity, appeal to. *See* under Fathers
 Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus, ii. 43-45, 83
 Antonius, bishop of Chrysostom's party, ii.
 102
 Antony, St., 10, 117, 131, 132 ; letters to
 Constantine, 161 ; 169 ; letters to Gregory
 of Alexandria, 171 ; death, 243 ; saying
 to blind Didymus, 338 ; 498
 —, bishop of Fussala, ii. 251, 252
 —, Nestorian priest of Constantinople,
 ii. 330
 Antrim, ii. 416
 Anulinus, proconsul of Africa, 8, 19 ; ii.
 151
 Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica, 526 ; ii.
 96, 101
 Apamea, in Syria, 405, 529 ; ii. 242, 505
 — in Bithynia, ii. 67, 96
 Aphaca, in Mount Lebanon, 125
 Aphraates, a visitor to St. Chrysostom, ii.
 94
 —, a monk, at Antioch, 375
 Aphrodite, temple at Jerusalem, 120 ; at
 Aphaca, 125

- Apiarius, priest of Sicca, ii. 248-253
 Apis, 529
Apocrisiarii, ii. 273, 280, 456
Apocrypha, the, ii. 20, 130
Apocryphal writings, ii. 123, 127, 207
Apollinarianism, 64, 326, 327, 434, 447-449, 451, 520; ii. 162, 164, 255, 259, 299, 356, 361, 362, 384, 385, 392, 398, 526; falsification of texts, 448, 455, ii. 374, 375, 382, 463
Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, and his father, 115, 198, 314, 326, 327, 380, 387, 424, 447-449, 520; ii. 382, 460, 481
 —, *Sidonius*, bishop of Clermont, ii. 26
Apollo, 50, 318, 319
*Apollo*s, ii. 67
Apology of *Rufinus*, ii. 54
Apostates, excluded from communion in sickness, 29; classified at *Ancyra*, 35.
 See *Julian*
Apostles in the Jewish organization, ii. 192
Apostles' Creed, old Roman form of, 176; ii. 331, 476. *See* also *Creeds*
Apostolical succession, ii. 327
Apotactitæ, 524
Appianus, duke in Mesopotamia, ii. 355
Apringius, bishop of *Chalcis*, ii. 344
 —, proconsul of *Africa*, ii. 155
Apronianus, counsel for *Felix* of *Aptunga*, 23
 —, prefect at *Rome*, 311
Aptunga (*Autumna*), 17, 23, 24
Aquæ Salviæ (*Tre Fontane*), 127
Aquilaia, 27, 47, 195, 382, 397; Council, 441, 442; 508, 537, 538; ii. 119, 221, 419
Aquilinus, bishop of *Byblos*, ii. 490
Aquitania, ii. 125
Arabia, represented at *Nicæa*, 78; 215, 304, 428, 460
Arabissus, a fortress, ii. 100, 101, 104, 144
Arbitration, before a bishop, ii. 11
Arbogast, master of the soldiery, 536, 537
Arcadia, sister of *Theodosius II.*, ii. 282, 382
Arcadius, bishop and papal representative at *Ephesus*, ii. 311, 327
 —, son of *Theodosius*, 459, 534; ii. 1, 3; appointment of *St. Chrysostom*, 28, 29; 37; law against heretics, 3, 38, 191; visited shrines, 39; kindly but weak, 42; terms with *Goths*, 42, 43; 47, 60, 65, 72, 73, 75; abstained from communion with *St. Chrysostom*, 78; 92, 98, 118, 140; and the *Jews*, 191, 192; his forum, 334; 515, 533
 —, Spanish martyr under *Gaiseric*, ii. 404
Arcaph. *See* *John Arcaph*
Archdeacon, 17, 78, 118, 541; ii. 37, 67, 190, 288, 308, 329, 372, 419, 428, 433, 514
Archelaus, a consular at *Tyre*, 148
 —, son of *Herod the Great*, 481
 —, a bishop at *Ephesus* in 431...ii. 329
Archidamus, papal representative at *Sardica*, 181
Archontes, imperial delegates at *Chalcedon*, ii. 515
Arculf, Gallic bishop and pilgrim, 121, 122
Ares, 507
Arethusa, in *Syria*, 141, 179, 219, 308
Argyll, Duke of, ii. 418
Arianism, opposed by *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, 34; beginnings of, chap. v. p. 53; tyranny of, 56; rationalism of, 58; original elements, 58; first and second landmarks, 61; letter of *Arius* to *Alexander*, 63; system contradictory, 64; letter of *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* to *Paulinus* of *Tyre*, 65; "creature" used of the Son of God, 65; encyclical of *Alexander*, 67; texts against, 67; use of hypostasis, 68; *Constantine's* first step, 68; the question vital, 70, 92; attraction and tenacity of, 71; seven main arguments stated and answered, 72, 73; issues, 73, 74; number of bishops at *Nicæa*, 80; evasions and quibbles, 86; disingenuity, 87; *Arians* summoned by *Constantine*, 119; crypto-Arianism, 138; unscrupulousness, 140; second *Arian Creed*, 143; an *Arian* episcopate, 168; ferocity, 170; Semi-Arianism, 175, 247; *Gloria Patri*, 197; second *Arian* persecution, 215; conspiracy against *Euphrates* of *Cologne*, 216; associated with persecution, 232; variations of, 246; *Acacian* (*Homean*) *Arianism*, 249, 342; ultra-Arianism (*Anomæan*), 250; its craft, 272; its last Creed, 293; semi-Arian meetings in year 366...357; lingering in villages, ii. 242; in decay at *Constantinople*, ii. 255, 299
Arianus, in *Asia Minor*, 447
Ariminum, 175; council in year 358, 264; anathemas at, 269; results of, 283; case of subscribing bishops, 324; its creed anathematized by semi-Arians, 358; 488; ii. 136, 492
Aristaces (*Arisdaghes*), bishop from Greater *Armenia*, 79, 112
Aristolaus, tribune and notary, ii. 361, 362, 372, 373, 388, 389
Aristotle, use of *ousia*, 90; admired by *Julian*, 295; 521; ii. 16, 413, 490
Arius, supported *Meletius*, 54; deacon and priest, 55; aimed at episcopate, 55; description of, 56, 113; opinions, 60; in *Palestine*, 61; letter to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, 62; at *Nicomedia*, 63; letter to *Alexander*, 63; *Thalia*, 64, 91, 139, 409; at *Nicæa*, 85; "Porphyrrians," 113; recall, 136, 137, 143; recognised at *Jerusalem*, 153; death, 158-160; called the Son God's perfect creature, 276; his dialectic skill, ii. 166
 —, an adherent of the heresiarch, 61
Arles, council in year 314...25, 27, 31, 76, 206; town described, 26; foundation of the church, 27; bishop at *Sardica*, 181;

- council in year 353...225; privileges of the see, ii. 124, 151, 185, 210, 247, 419, 420. *See* also under bishops Marinus, Saturninus, Heros, Patroclus, Honoratus, Hilary
- Armagh, ii. 418
- Armenia, 79, 112, 191, 193, 233, 263, 290, 313, 375; ii. 89, 390, 393
- Armentarius, bishop of Embrun, ii. 420
- Arminius, British cleric at Arles, 28
- Arsacius, intruded bishop of Constantinople, ii. 87, 93, 94, 99
- Arsenius, Meletian bishop in the Thebaid, 147, 150, 167, 200, 244
- , tutor of Arcadius and Honorius, 540; ii. 2, 66, 144, 245
- Arsinoë, ii. 22
- Art, Christian, in Rome, 361, 476
- Artebius, 304
- Artemius, 310
- Artemon (Artemas), 58, 68
- Article, the sixth Anglican, ii. 130; the twenty-first, ii. 515
- Articles, the Twelve. *See* Cyril of Alexandria
- Artotyritæ, 524
- Ascalon, 62, 308
- Ascanian lake, near Nicæa, 76, 84
- Ascension Day, ii. 238, 246
- Asceticism, in Ancyran canons, 36; in Neocæsarean canons, 38; St. Martin, 399, 400
- Ascholius (Acholius), bishop of Thessalonica, 407, 414, 415, 425, 451, 454
- Ascitæ (Ascodrogitæ), 524
- Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, 62, 141, 177, 181-185, 188
- Asclepius, confessor under Valens, 378
- Asculum, ii. 508, 510
- Asella, a Roman lady, 477
- Ashtarothe (Astarte), ii. 248, 405
- Asiatic Churchmen, harassed by Licinius, 4; held Neocæsarea illustrious, 37; Easter observance, 100
- Asinarian gate at Rome, 21
- Aspar, general, ii. 504
- Asphalius, an Arian priest of Antioch, 260
- Assyria, possessions of St. Peter's, Rome, in, 127
- Asterius, an Arian sophist, 86, 156, 175
- , a bishop at Sardica, 182
- , an Arian bishop, 274
- , a presbyter of Constantinople, ii. 451, 469
- Asylum, privilege of, ii. 11, 41, 42
- Atarbius, bishop of Neocæsarea, 388
- Ataulph, the Goth, ii. 139
- Aterbius, anti-Originist, 541; ii. 49
- Athanaric, the Goth, 503
- Athanasius, St., De Incarnatione, 11; on Meletian schism, 53, 55; on persecution of bishops by Arians, 56; opening of his career, 56; use of logic against Arianism, 64; supported Alexander, 66; his loyalty to the Redeemer, 67; on number of Nicene bishops, 77; at Nicea, 78, 94; on Leontius of Cæsarea, 79; on Greek terms, 92; festal letters, 114, 116; absent when Alexander died, 115; date of his episcopate, 116; Egyptian encyclical upon his election, 117; lightly adopted two imputations, 119; conventual community, 131; visited Thebaid, 135; first troubles, chap. ix. p. 136; Hooker on, 142; Newman on, 142; practical, 142; preaching, 142; election said to be irregular, 144; civil appeal, 144; apology against Arians, 144, 166, 167, 188, 223; accused of taxing Egypt, assisting a rebel, and breaking a chalice, 145; the hand of Arsenius, 147; summoned to Tyre, 149; accumulated charges, 150; Mareotis inquiry, 152; before Constantine, 152, 153; five charges, including that about cornships, 154; relation to Marcellus, 157; History of the Arians, 158, 168, 195; on death of Arius, 160; restored by Constantine II., 164; renewed charges, 165, 168; encyclical on Gregory, 168; visited Rome, 169, 170, 180; his aunt, 170; account of second Antiochene Creed, 179; at Milan, 180; at Sardica, 181-185; on Constantine and Stephen, 193; at Aquileia, 195; return in year 346...196-199; use of Gloria Patri, 198; position in year 355...239; in church of St. Theonas, 240; his "flight," 241; discourses against Arians, 244; letters to Serapion, 232-234, 245, 289; defence concerning flight and letter to monks, 245; French biography of, 245; on semi-Arians, 248; on the "dated" Creed, 267, 272; probably not at Seleucia, 271; against Macedonianism, 289; on Prov. viii. 22...291; accusation of conniving at murder of George, 310; hated by Julian, 321, 322; baptized pagan ladies, 322; a "little cloud," 322; admired by Gibbon, 323; on hypostasis in year 362...325; letter to Jovian, 344; at Antioch, 346, 347; return in year 364...347; fifth exile, 355; letter from Damasus, 365; letter to Africans, 365; death, 376; on Basil, 389; ii. 18, 56, 143, 193, 224, 409, 425, 517; Cyril on early life of, 272; balanced theology, 219, 257; Theotocos, 257, 263, 272; Apollinarianism and Letter to Epictetus, 260, 361, 366, 374, 375, 383, 492; use of "person" and "nature," 279, 382, 383, 461, 482; cited as an authority, 272, 322, 366, 372, 375, 389, 447, 520, 521
- Athanasius, bishop of Anazarbus, 65, 251
- , bishop of Perrha, ii. 422, 423, 429, 490, 498, 539, 540
- , a deacon of Seleucia, ii. 451

Athenais (Eudocia), wife of Theodosius II., ii. 237, 283
 Athene (Athena), 129, 507
 Athens, 79, 301, 314, 318; ii. 99
 Athyra, a Thracian fortress, ii. 99
 Atlas, Mount, ii. 304
 Attalus, an Arian priest, 442
 —, usurping Emperor, ii. 137
 Atticus, a Catholic in St. Jerome's *Dialogues*, ii. 181
 —, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 99, 140, 141, 191, 197, 204, 238, 244, 250, 263, 277, 291, 357, 403, 409, 447
 —, archdeacon of Constantinople, ii. 514.
See under Aetius
 Attila the Hun, 442; ii. 137, 234, 508
 Audians, 523
 Auditor, among Manicheans, 511, 513; ii. 132
 Augustinus, an African ædile, 24
 Augsburg, 11
 Augustæum at Constantinople, 128, 129, 222; ii. 40, 76, 87
 Augustal prefect of Egypt, 104, 105, 532
 Augustine, St., archbishop of Canterbury, 27; ii. 8, 31, 116
 —, St., bishop of Hippo, on Mensurius of Carthage, 16; Psalmus contra partem Donati, 17; pun, 19; quoting Rheticius on baptism, 21; using a Canon of Arles, 29; on appeal of Donatists, 31; on sense of Scripture, 87; at Milan, 180; on Sardican council, 190; on Christology of Donatus, 209; on recitation of Psalms, 240; on Hosius, 254; on Julian, 297; on Luciferians, 330; letter to Anicia Proba, 361; his early history, 492-494; conversion, 498, 499; early works, 499; baptism, 500; on Manicheanism, 510; at Hippo as priest, 539; ii. 4, 5; Donatist controversy, 6; as preacher, 6, 7; consecrated bishop, 8, 9; method of life, 9-13; On the Christian conflict, 13; Two books to Simplicianus, 18, 217; at Carthage in 397...20; On Christian Doctrine, and against Donatism, 21; letter to Glorius, 21, 22; on council of Sardica, 22; works at close of fourth century, 24; the Confessions, 24, 25; on circus, 33; interpretation of Scripture, 52; letter to Theodorus, 110; controversy with Petilian, 113; on coercion, 115, 116, 135; correspondence with St. Jerome, 129; his burdens, 130-132; discussion with Felix, 131; On the nature of good, 132; at Carthage, 133; the City of God, 138, 139, 173; the 128th Epistle, 148; Council in 411...149-154; the Breviculus collationis, 154; on Sermon on the Mount, 156; Augustinianism, 160, 227; on Pelagius, 161; give what Thou commandest, 163; on Cælestius, 165, 168; letter from Pelagius, 166; De gestis Pelagii, 167, 204; On

deserts of sin, 169, 170; On the spirit and the letter, 171; letter to Honoratus, 172; On faith and works, 174; on riches and swearing, 175; On nature and grace, 175, 203; his courtesy, 177; letter to Juliana, 178; relations with Orosius, 179; On origin of soul, 180; on synod of Diospolis, 189; at Milevum, 201; on letter of Prædicator, 207; excuses for Zosimus, 209; at Carthage in 418...215; On the grace of Christ, On original sin, 216; on predestinarianism, 217; his sacramental belief, 219, 220; On marriage, 222; on the two letters of Pelagius, 223; on Julian, 223; letter to Sixtus, 227; On grace and free-will, and On censure and grace, 228; On the predestination of the saints, and On the gift of perseverance, 233; letter to Boniface I., 249; hearing of Pelagian defeat in Britain, 234; death and summary of, 304-307; against Leporius, 395; praised by Celestine, 401; sermon On the times of the barbarians, 403
 Augustus, temple of, at Ancyra, 34
 Aurelian, emperor, 21
 Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, 539; ii. 4, 20, 24, 107, 108, 110, 133, 148, 166, 174, 214, 216, 249, 405
 —, Luciferian bishop at Rome, 395
 — Symmachus. *See under Symmachus*
 Ausonius, on Arles, 26, 27; on Treves, 155; on Carthage, ii. 404
 Autun, 20, 481; ii. 124
 Auxentius, Arian bishop of Milan, 233, 238, 268, 350, 351, 365, 382, 397, 399
 — II., Mercurinus, Arian bishop of Milan, 488, 489, 497
 Auxerre, ii. 234, 246, 420
 Auxonius, proconsul of Asia, 440
 Aventine at Rome, 169; ii. 137
 Avitianus, bishop of Rouen, 27
 Avitus, name of two friends of Orosius, ii. 179
 Axum (Auxume), 216, 243
 Azadas, a Persian martyr, 205

B

Baal-prophets, ii. 491
 Bab-el-Mandeb Straits, 215
 Babylas, St., bishop of Antioch and martyr, 319, 427; ii. 39
 Babylon, ii. 138, 192
 Bacarius, a Georgian prince, 131
 Bacchus, 199, 309, 529
 Bagai (Baga, Bagaia), 211, 539; ii. 117, 152
 Bagdad, ii. 256
 Balsamon, Greek canonist, 439
 Baluze, ii. 264, 271
 Bannavem Taberniæ, ii. 415
 Baptism, called Enlightenment, 39; Seal of the Lord, 376; Initiation, 413; catechetical instruction in the Creed, 258,

- 434, 484; baptismal confession, 87, 484, ii. 331; baptismal formula, i. 198, 289, 392; administered on Easter Eve, 479, 484, 500, ii. 71, 79, 81, 121, 234; on Whitsun Eve, i. 413; rites of, 421, 500; white robes at, 162, 433, 500; ii. 81; ministers of, ii. 121; doctrine of infant baptism, ii. 107, 169, 207, 212, 213, 221; salvation of unbaptized infants, ii. 167, 174, 180, 201; of the unbaptized, ii. 211, 276; baptism of desire and of blood, i. 537; baptism deferred, 39, 162, 302, 360, 398, 399, 415, 421, 433, ii. 143, 169; post-baptismal sin, 109, ii. 122, 123, and see Novatianism; doubtful baptism, ii. 109; heretical or schismatical baptism, 29, 213, 479, ii. 5, 107, 110, 151, 397; rebaptism among Donatists, 208, 395, 396, 540, ii. 22, 112, 114, 117, 135, 151; among Eunomians, i. 289, 457; among Luciferians, 331; Tertullian on baptism, 39; Cyprian, 29, ii. 151, 174, 397; Rheticius of Autun, i. 21; Basil, 39; Gregory, 39, 421; Pacian, 397; Jovinian, 513, 514, ii. 181; Ambrose, 536; Chrysostom, ii. 71, 221; Augustine, ii. 113, 168, 169, 174, 180, 219; Pelagius, ii. 166, 207, 215; Cælestius, ii. 167-169, 201; Theodore, ii. 200; Julian of Eclanum, ii. 221
- Baranina (Barabbas), a Jew, 481
- Barasides (Bresidas), imperial emissary, 355
- Barba, Arian bishop of Constantinople, ii. 140
- Barbation, ex-monk of Milan, ii. 14
- Barcelona, 181, 397
- Barking, 481
- Barnabas, St., ii. 332, 499
- Barsumas, monophysite abbot, ii. 471, 479, 480, 482, 484, 488, 527
- Baruch, ii. 67
- Basil, bishop of Amasea, 34, 43
- , a bishop, friend of Theodoret, ii. 437
- , bishop of Ancyra, 35, 158, 181, 184, 219, 248, 256, 258, 260, 267, 270, 274, 278, 280, 341, 369
- , bishop of Ephesus, ii. 538
- , a deacon of Constantinople, ii. 239, 268, 277; another (or the same?), ii. 391-393; another, ii. 495
- , a priest and martyr at Ancyra, 311
- , a priest of Constantinople, ii. 509
- , a priest and papal representative at Chalcedon, ii. 508, 510, 511
- the Great, bishop of Cæsarea, on Gregory of Neocæsarea, 37; condemned postponement of baptism, 39; at Athens, 301; at Cæsarea, 356; on Damasus, 364; his episcopate, 366; early life, 368; conspicuous in Asia Minor, 369; consecrated to Cæsarea, 370; divisions of his episcopate, 371; before Modestus, 372; on St. Athanasius, 376; on Antiochus, 378; on Arian persecution, 379; letters, 381, 392; unsuccessful in everything, 385; letter to St. Ambrose, 386; on Antiochene schism, 386, 387; personal sorrows, 388; on Macedonianism and hypostasis, 389; on partition of Cappadocia, 390; rupture with St. Gregory Nazianzen, 391; book on the Holy Spirit, 251, 391, 392; death, 393; successor, 425; ii. 15, 89, 260, 528; cited as an authority, 263, 309, 322, 392, 520, 521
- Basil, bishop of Seleucia, ii. 450, 451, 457, 460, 467, 479, 482-484, 486-488, 491, 492, 519, 520, 544
- Basilica, origin and form of, 126. *See* also Churches, description of
- Basilina, mother of Julian, 295
- Basilinopolis, ii. 539
- Basiliscus, St., martyr, ii. 105, 106, 410
- Bassian, bishop of Ephesus, ii. 537, 538
- , bishop of Lodi, 442
- Bassus, prefect at Rome, 475
- , a bishop, ii. 9
- Baucalis, at Alexandria, 55, 113
- Bauto, master of the soldiery, 475; ii. 28
- Bede, his use of word "parish," 30; on the holy places, 121; ii. 31, 220, 414
- Belisarius, ii. 304
- Belshazzar, ii. 141
- Bema, 513
- Benedict Biscop, ii. 247
- , St., 169
- Beneventum, ii. 98
- Benevolus, secretary of state, 488
- Benjamin, a Persian deacon and martyr, ii. 245
- Benson, archbishop, 27; ii. 227, 542
- Berenice, ii. 143
- Berkeley, bishop, 299
- Bernard, St., ii. 19
- Beræa in Syria, 138, 140, 290, 308; ii. 241
- in Thrace, 235, 255, 261, 367
- Beronicianus, bishop of Tyre, ii. 389
- Berytus, 62, 309; ii. 441, 443, 505, 536
- Besançon, ii. 420
- Besulas (Vesulas), a deacon of Carthage, ii. 313, 318
- Bethlehem, 123, 481, 541, 542; ii. 200, 230
- Bethshan, ii. 59
- Beveridge, bishop, 107
- Bigg, Dr. C., 93, 493; ii. 50
- Bindley, Mr. T. H., 436
- Bingham, 465; ii. 11, 12
- Biserræ (Beziers), near Narbonne, 238
- Bishops, consecration of, 29, 174
- Bithynia, 65, 70, 76, 112, 356, 521; ii. 28, 73, 86, 240, 513
- Blæsilla, Roman lady, 478, 480
- Blasphemia of Sirmium, 253. *See* Creeds
- Blemmyans, a barbarous tribe, ii. 411
- Blunt, J. J., 7
- Boethius, 361
- Boissier, 309
- Bologna, 11, 397, 442; ii. 134

- Bona, a port in Africa, ii. 5
 Boniface, count of Africa, ii. 304, 305
 — I., pope, ii. 222, 248-250, 252, 419
 —, a priest and papal representative at Chalcedon, ii. 510, 511
 —, bishop of Carthage, ii. 252
 —, St., 535
 Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, 526; ii. 145
 Borborians, a Gnostic sect, 251
 Bordeaux, 464, 465; ii. 124
 Bosphorus, 222; ii. 40, 74, 410, 515
 Bostra in Arabia, 304, 309
 Botrus, a priest of Carthage, 17
 Bourbons, ii. 2
 Braga, ii. 26
 Bramhall, archbishop, ii. 332
Breastplate of St. Patrick, ii. 417
 Brescia, 23, 397, 442, 488, 538; ii. 152
Breviarium, a summary of the canons of Hippo, 20
Breviculus collationis, ii. 154
 — *de nomine Acacii*, ii. 489
Brevis, an inventory, 17
 Brie, 481
 Briso, chamberlain of Eudoxia, ii. 47, 73
 Britain, St. Alban, 11; bishops at Arles, 27, 28; replied to Sardican encyclical, 189; at Ariminum, 268; 316, 344, 460, 463; pilgrims at Bethlehem, 481; ii. 145, 234, 235, 240, 246, 332
 Brito (Britannius), bishop of Treves, 463
 Broglie, de, 15, 138, 163, 361, 496
 Browning, Robert, ii. 259
 Bryce, Prof. J., 133
 Bull, bishop, ii. 264
 Burgundians, 388
 Bury, professor J. B., 29; ii. 3, 37, 62, 134
 Butler, bishop, 416
 Byblos, ii. 490
 Byrsa (Bozrah), a hill at Carthage, ii. 149
 Byzacena, province in Africa, 277; ii. 20
 Byzantinism, 264; ii. 533
 Byzantium, 79, 80, 81, 124, 128, 129, 159, 439; ii. 515

C

- Cabarsussi (Cebarsussa), 539
 Cabasa, ii. 488
 Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, 8, 17-23, 25, 27, 28, 31, 32; at Nicæa, 80, 104; 206-208, 213; ii. 21, 130, 151, 152, 249
 —, bishop of Spoleto, 226
 —, provincial governor in Africa, ii. 117
 Cælestis, Carthaginian goddess, 534; ii. 24, 405
 Cælian hill at Rome, 21
 Cæsar, 267
 Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 107, 141, 164, 296, 308, 311, 318, 356, 368, 391; ii. 89, 94
 Cæsarea in Cappadocia, bishops of (see also under each name): Leontius, bishop before 325...79; Hermogenes...95; Dianius, before 341...172; Eusebius, before 365...356; Basil, 370...370; Heladius, 379...425; Pharetrius, before 404...ii. 90; Firmus, before 431...ii. 301; Thalassius, 439...ii. 411
 Cæsarea in Mauritania (Algiers), ii. 248
 Cæsarea in Palestine, 103, 199, 258; ii. 186, 244, 332, 534. See also under bishops Eusebius, Acacius, Gelasius, Eulogius
 Cæsarean principles of Roman Empire, 75, 415, 517; 232, 485; ii. 471
 Cæsariana in Africa, ii. 117
 Cæsarius, bishop of Arles, 27; ii. 247
 —, imperial commissioner, 505-507
 —, a physician, brother of St. Gregory, 305
 Caius, a deacon, adherent of Arius, 61
 —, priest and writer at Rome, 127
 —, Arian bishop, 268
 Cakemen, 521
 Calabria, 79; ii. 99
 Calama in Numidia, ii. 133, 134
 Calendar. See Liturgical
 Caliaris in Sardinia, 106, 226
 Caligula, 164
 Calligonus, imperial chamberlain, 488
 Callinicus, a Meletian bishop, 145, 150
 —, a city in Osrhoene, 508
 Callistus, St., pope, 475
 Calopodius, Eutychian priest of Constantinople, ii. 513
 Calosyrus, bishop, correspondent of Cyril, ii. 424
 Calpornius, deacon, father of St. Patrick, ii. 415
 Calvia, in Africa, ii. 112
 Calvin, ii. 219
 Calvinism, ii. 159, 226, 400
 Calycadnus, a river in Cilicia, 266
 Camillus, Genoese priest, ii. 400
Cancelli, ii. 515
 Candes, in diocese of Tours, ii. 19
 Candidian, pagan correspondent of St. Gregory, 312
 —, count, imperial representative at Ephesus, ii. 312, 317, 318, 325, 326, 336
 Cannæ, 394
 Cannes, ii. 247
 Canon, standard of faith, 82
 — of New Testament, 13
 — of Scripture, ii. 20, 123, 241
 Canons of Eusebius, 477
 — of Arles, 28; of Ancyra, 35; of Neocæsarea, 38; of Nicæa, 102-110, and see Nicene canons; of dedication council at Antioch, 173; of Sardica, 185; of Carthage, 212; of Constantinople, 437, ii. 545, 546; of African councils, ii. 20, 108-111, 132, 212, 214; of Pope Innocent, ii. 121; of Turin, 124; Sardican-Nicene

canons, 248-253; of Ephesus, 332; of Chalcedon, 533; synodical collection, 545
 Canopus, 531
 Canterbury, Cathedral, 127; St. Martin's, 398
 Capito, bishop in Sicily, 79
 Capitolinus, governor in Thrace, 311
 Cappadocia, 67, 78, 233, 288, 296, 359; partition of, 390; ii. 53, 89
 Capreolus, bishop of Carthage, ii. 313, 323, 395, 405
 Capua, 27, 192, 225, 526; ii. 9
 Cardinal, original idea of term, 55
 Caria, 360
 Carlyle, on Arianism, 75
 Caroline, queen, 71, 108
 Carosus, monk of Constantinople, ii. 512
 Carpones, an adherent of Arius, 61
 Carrhæ (Charræ), 308, 534; ii. 440, 441, 490
 Carterius, Macedonian bishop of Constantinople, 521; ii. 239
 Carthage, council in year 525...104; bishop at Sardica, 181; Donatist inquiry at, 206; the "first" council about the year 345...212; St. Augustine at, 493; council in 256...ii. 5; bishop of, consenting to consecrate St. Augustine, 8; council in 397...20; heathen temples at, 24; pagan demonstration at, 133; councils, 107, 108, 111-113, 117, 201, 212; conference with Donatists, 149; letter from Atticus, 205; taken by Gaiseric, 403, 404; moral state of, 406
 —, bishops of (see also under each name): Mensurius...16; Cæcilian, 311...17 [Donatists; Majorinus, 311...19; Donatus the Great, before 317...207, 209; Parmenian...ii. 24; Primian, before 393...i. 539; Donatist secession, Maximian, 393...i. 539]; Gratus, before 343...i. 209; Restitutus, before 359...268; Genethlius, before 390...539; Aurelius, 392...539; Capreolus, before 431...ii. 313; Quodvultdeus, before 439...ii. 405; Deogratias, before 455...ii. 406; Boniface, before 525...ii. 252
 Cassian, John, 540; ii. 37, 96, 196, 230, 231, 247, 288, 401, 402
 Cassianus, Donatist bishop, 334
 Cassisiacum, 499
 Castabala, 357
 Castalian fount, 319
 Castellum Lemellense, 335
 Castor, Gallic bishop, ii. 231
 Castorius, correspondent of Augustine, ii. 111
 Castulus, Arian priest at Milan, 485
 Catacombs, 475
 Catechetical school at Alexandria, 338
 Catechumens, classes of, 39, 152, 373; St. Martin as a catechumen, 399; ii. 24, 230
Causa finita est, ii. 215

Cazenove, Dr., 257, 350, 401
 Cecropius, bishop of Nicomedia, 264
 —, bishop of Sebastopolis, ii. 505, 521
 Celerina, a church at Carthage, ii. 405
 Celestius (Celestius), priest of Carthage, 17
 Celestiacus, exile from Carthage, ii. 407
 Celestine, pope, ii. 212, 213, 225, 234, 246, 248, 250-252; Nestorian controversy, 274; 276, 288; action against Nestorius, 289-292; letters at Ephesus, 322, 327; 332; on appointment of Maximian, 356; papal assumptions, 357; on anxieties about Nestorianism, 358; on episcopal translations, 386; 401, 414, 415, 419, 521
 Celibacy of clergy, 109, 479; ii. 25, 121, 123, 141
 Cells, the, in Egypt, 243, 540
 Celsus, 315
 Celtic Christianity, ii. 418
 Censor, 147, 148
 Centumcellæ, 233
 Ceylon, ii. 256
 Chair of Peter, ii. 500
 Chæreas, count of Osroene, ii. 444, 471, 490
 Chæremon, an Alexandrian at Constantinople, ii. 274, 281
 —, an Egyptian abbot, ii. 401
 Chahdoust. *See* Sadoth
 Chalcedon, 79, 80, 104; ii. 47, 65, 207; oriental deputation at, 344; council in 451...423, 428, 514, 516; preliminary discussions, 518; its "acts," including those of two previous councils, 519; partisan violence at, 526, 527; first session, 515; second, 521; third, 522; fourth, 524; fifth, 528; sixth, 533; seventh, 534; eighth, 535; ninth, 537; eleventh, 540; thirteenth, 540; fourteenth, 539; fifteenth, 544; sixteenth, 545; committee for drawing up Definition of Faith, 530; canons, 533; status of Chalcedon, 534; silence on letter to Maris, 537; final scene, 540, 541; ninth and seventeenth canons, 542; the end, 548; letter to Leo, 548; adherents nicknamed, 550; doctrinal significance of the Definition, 550
 Chalcis, 405
 Chanter, ii. 87
 Charisius, priest of Philadelphia, ii. 330
 Charles the Great, 76, 364; ii. 173, 297
 Charles I., ii. 297
 Chartres, 402
 Charus, deacon, native of Hippo, ii. 199
Cheirotonia, meaning of term, 99
 Chelidonius, bishop of Besançon, ii. 420
 Cheren, near Alexandria, 322
 Chersonesus, ii. 450
 Chi, 318
 Chichester, 188
 China, Nestorianism in, ii. 256, 385
Chorepiscopi, Ancyran canon on, 35; Neocæsarean canon on, 40; at Nicæa, 77, 80;

Nicene canons, 109; in Egypt, 145; Antiochene canon on, 173; 388; ii. 516
 Chrestus, bishop of Nicæa, 120
 —, bishop of Syracuse, 26–28
 Chrim, 335, ii. 25
 Christ Church, the original, 126
 Christmas, 421, 518; ii. 246
 Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, 538; ii. 82, 98
 Chrysanthus, Novatian bishop of Constantinople, ii. 240
 Chrysaphius, imperial chamberlain, ii. 434, 502, 504
 Chrysostom, St. John, on monasticism, 132; on Eustathius, 140; an Antiochene canon used against, 173; compared with bishop Paul, 223; on Meletius, 292; on pomp, 363, 364; ordained priest, 505; homilies on the statues, 505; ii. 15; 18; On the Priesthood, ii. 28, 82; Constantinople, 30; his preaching, 31–36; on excessive mourning, 33; diocesan administration, 36; resemblance to Laud, 37; work among pagans and heretics, 38; Antiochene schism, 39; relics, 39; against games and theatre, 40; on riches, 40; case of Antoninus, 43, 44; case of Gerontius, 45, 46; hymnody, 46, 47; Severian, 47; on anthropomorphic texts, 52; Tall brothers, 60, 61; Theophilus, 61, 64; Epiphanius, 64; plotters against him, 65; Pauline phrases, 67, 68; charges at the Oak, 69–72; favourite texts, 72; exiled, 73; recalled, 73–75; on Herodias, 77; Easter Eve in year 404....79; view of Roman see, 82; letters to Pope Innocent, 83, 102; life in danger, 85; exiled again, 86; at Nicæa, 89; at Cucusus, 91; his letters, 92; affairs at Constantinople, 92; life in exile, 99, 100–102; writings in exile, 103; his death, 105; his case at Rome in 405...121; reference to case of, 132; on Anthemius, 140; 144; refers to a Pelagius, 161; quoted by Pelagius, 176; Jews, 192; name restored to diptychs, 196, 197; Innocent on, 197; quoted by Julian of Eclanum, 221; knew Philip of Side, 238; Sisinnius, 240; anti-Nestorian statement, 257; Cyril on, 280; Celestine on, 291, 357; Nestorius on, 299; John of Antioch on, 389; Socrates on, 408; Proclus on, 409; removal of body to Constantinople, 410; 411; festival of, 409
 —, a title given to Antiochus of Ptolemais, ii. 49
 Church, Dean, 130, 133, 455; ii. 158, 199
 Churches, at Nicomedia, 6; Eusebius on, 8; at Tyre, 9; destroyed by Diocletian, 12; at Cirta, 15; at Carthage, 16; the Lateran basilica, 21, 126; at Aptunga, 24; at Arles, 27; parish churches, 55; at Alexandria, 55, 56, 117, 167, 200, 310; at Rome, 55, 126, 127, 208, 362; at Ancyra,

258; at Neocæsarea, 38; at Nicæa, 81; at the holy places, 120–124; at Tiberias and Nazareth, 124; at Heliopolis, 125; at Nicomedia, 125; at Constantinople, 129, 179; at Antioch, 125, 172, 291, 504; at Cirta, 208; at Milan, 229, 483–487, 496; in Cappadocia, 296; building grants, 307; at Damascus and Berytus, 309; at Hippo, 539; ii. 5; at Alexandria, 194, 195; at Constantinople, 31, 39, 40, 63, 66, 69, 80, 239, 268, 334; at Antioch, 243; at Carthage, 24, 107, 405; in Drypia, 39; at Edessa, 355; at Ephesus, 313, 317, 480; at Metz, 508; in Numidia, 117; in Persia, 145; in Pontus, 105; at Rome, 205
 Churches, dedications or titles (names asterisked are of later date):—

(1) Non-local ecclesiastical:

Anastasia, at Constantinople, 410–415, 432, ii. 31, 61, 69,

Apostles, at Antioch, 293, 324; at Constantinople, 128, 129, 163, 253, ii. 31, 40, 64, 69, 74, 79, 88, 239, 341, 410, 432, 505; at Milan, 229, 484, 486, 496

*Cross, Holy, at Rome, 127

*Helena, in England, 124

Irene. *See* Peace

John Baptist, St., at Hebdomon, near Constantinople, ii. 63; *at Rome, 126

*Laurence, St., at Milan, 230

*Martin, St., at Canterbury, 398

Mary, St., at Ephesus, ii. 317, 324, 331, 480; at Rome (two churches), 362, ii. 412

Paul, St., at Constantinople, 179, 180, ii. 31

Peace, at Constantinople, 129, 159, ii. 31, 268; at Hippo, 539, ii. 5

Peter, St., at Carthage, ii. 405

Peter and Paul, SS., near Chalcedon, ii. 40, 66

Saviour, at Nicomedia, 125; at Rome, 21, 126

Sophia, St. (The Holy and Eternal Wisdom), at Constantinople, 128, 129, 179, 222, 281, 309, 408, 413, 418, 419, 431, 432, ii. 31, 39, 40, 42, 65, 86, 92, 268, 269, 420, 467

Stephen, St., at Odessa, ii. 355; (oratory) at Metz, ii. 508

Thomas, St., in Drypia, near Constantinople, ii. 39

(2) Local:

Alexandria: Alexander, ii. 194; Annianus, bishop, 55; Baucalis, 55, 56, 113, 200; Dionysius, bishop, 55, 117, 200, 310, 355; Pierius, presbyter, 55; Quirinus, 167, 200; Serapion, 55; Theonas, bishop, 56, 200, 321, 377

Antioch: Babylas, bishop and martyr, 427

Arles: * Trophimus, bishop, 27

Churches, dedications or titles—*continued*.

- Bethlehem: Nativity, 123
 Cappadocia: Mamas of Cæsarea, martyr, 296
 Carthage: Celerina, ii. 405; Cyprian, bishop and martyr (two churches), ii. 405; Scillitan martyrs, ii. 405
 Chalcedon: Euphemia, virgin and martyr, ii. 515
 Cirta: (cemetery of) Martyrs, 15
 Comana: Basiliscus, martyr, ii. 105, 106, 410
 Constantinople: Martyrs, ii. 31; Mocius, martyr, ii. 334, 335
 Edessa: St. Barbara, ii. 444
 Ephesus: John the apostle, ii. 313, 326
 Jerusalem: Ascension, 124; Resurrection or Anastasis (also called Saviour and *Holy Cross), 121, 122, 149, 153, 541, ii. 185; Sepulchre, 122, 153, ii. 51
 Marseilles: Victor, martyr, ii. 247
 Milan: *Ambrose, bishop, 229, 496, 497, 518, ii. 18; Fausta, 229, 496; Felix and Nabor, martyrs, 229, 496; Gervasius and Protasius, martyrs (= *Ambrose, bishop), 496; Portian, 229, 483–485; *Victor, 483
 Rome: Agnes, virgin and martyr, 127, 363; Callistus, bishop (catacomb), 475; Clement, bishop, ii. 205; *Damasus, bishop, 475; Julian church, 362; Lateran, 21, 126, 208, 234, ii. 120, 123, 137; Laurence, martyr (two churches), 127, 362, 475; Liberius, bishop, 362; Paul, apostle and martyr, 127, ii. 56, 137; Peter, apostle and martyr, 126, 127, 169, 208, 234, 361, 364, 479, 513, ii. 7, 56, 120, 137, 138, 356, 500; Sicininus, 362
 (3) Imperial:
 Alexandria: Cæsarean (after Constantius), 231, 241, 242; ii. 195
 Antioch: Constantius (Golden church)
 Carthage: Gratian, ii. 405; Honorius, ii. 405; Theodosius, ii. 405
 Rome: Heleniana (Holy Cross), 127
 (4) Descriptive:
 Antioch: Golden, 125, 172, 197, 291, 320, 504, ii. 93, 243
 Carthage: Restored (restituta), ii. 20, 405
 Milan: Old, 486; New or Roman, 229, 484, 496
 Churches, description of: Tyre, 9; Resurrection, at Jerusalem, 121; St. Peter's, at Rome, 126; Golden church at Antioch, 172; at Cæsarea, 373; Anastasia, 412; Roman churches and catacombs, 475; St. Sophia, ii. 31; St. Euphemia, Chalcedon, ii. 515
 Churchwardens, 16
 Cicero, 30, 493, ii. 16, 92, 119
 Cilicia, 65, 78, 101, 280, 317; ii. 225, 365, 377

- Cinaron, ii. 195
 Circumcellions, 33, 210, 211; ii. 113, 114, 117, 152, 154
 Cirta (Constantina), 13, 14, 207, 208; ii. 21, 22, 111, 113, 117, 152
 Cities, sees transferred from villages to, 188
 Civil relations to Church, offices recognized as lawful at Arles, 29; ecclesiastical exemptions from, 307; ecclesiastical and civil parallelism, 103; civil appeals, 174; the Emperor and the Church, 496
 Clarke, Samuel, 71, 72
 Classical learning. *See* under Learning
 Claudian, Donatist bishop of Rome, 395, 510
 —, a priest, deputy of Pope Silvester at Arles, 28
 —, pagan poet: on Probus, 361; on Stilicho, ii. 2; on Arcadius, 3; on Eutropius and Rufinus, 28; on Eutropius, 40, 41; on Honorius, 119
 Claudius, an Italian bishop, 277
 —, a person mentioned by St. Jerome, ii. 163
 Cledonius, priest of Nazianzus, 447
 Clemens Maximus, usurping emperor, 460. *See* Maximus
 Clement, St., of Alexandria, ii. 50
 —, St., of Rome, ii. 205, 543
 Clergy, exemptions of, from public obligations, 8, 47; synod at Rome concerning, ii. 121, 122; secular business, 533; transfer, 533; crimes, 540. *See* also Celibacy
 Clinics, 39
 Clovis, 388; ii. 124
 Clyde, ii. 415, 416
 Cœlestius, Pelagian, ii. 165; his seven propositions, 167; 174, 181, 187, 201; at Rome, 204–206; 209–211, 216, 220, 225, 248, 276, 277, 333
 Cœnobitic life, 131–135
 Cognitor, ii. 149
 Colluthus, priest of Alexandria, 59, 70, 145
 Collyridians, 523
 Cologne (Agrippina), 20, 192, 216, 395
 Colosseum, 2
 Columba, St., ii. 17, 415–417
 Comana, ii. 105, 410
 Comitium, 470
 Commendations, prayers for the departed, ii. 132
 Commentaries. *See* Scripture, commentaries on
 Commodus, emperor, 164
 Commonitory of St. Vincent, ii. 396–399
 Communicatio idiomatum, ii. 263
 Community of goods, ii. 10
 Competents, 39
 Concussio, 503
 Confession, 527
 Confession of St. Patrick, ii. 415, 416
 Confessions of St. Augustine, 492; ii. 24, 163

Confirmation, mentioned at Arles, 29; ii. 25, 198, 481

Consistentes. See Co-standers

Consistory, 484, 491, 501

Constans, son of Constantine the Great, 164, 178, 192, 193, 197, 209, 219; ii. 115

Constantia, sister of Constantine the Great, 4, 62, 142, 249

— (Maiuma), port of Gaza, 125

—, in Cyprus. See Salamis

Constantina (Cirta), ii. 111

Constantine the Great, victory over Maxentius, 2; his arch, 2; Augustus, 2; vision, 3; statue, 3; spiritual state, 3; policy of toleration, 4; letters to Anulinus, 8, 19; gift and letter to Cæcilian, 8, 19; letter to Patricius, 19; letter to Miltiades, 20; letter to Marcus, 20; his wife Fausta, 21; donation to Silvester, 21; case of Felix, 23; letter to Ælafiis, 25; letter to Chrestus, 26; letter to bishops at Arles, 31; summons Cæcilian, 32; letter to Eumalius, 32; and Licinius, 41, 44, 45, 80; badly advised by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 44; character, 45; execution of his son, 45; enactments, 46; address to provincials of Palestine, 48; address to provincials of all the East, 50; first hears of Arianism, 51; first step in controversy, 68; called himself "bishop," 76, 144; invitational Nicene epistle, 76; letter to Alexandrians, 77, 113; invited Novatian bishop to Nicæa, 80; arrival at Nicæa, 80, 84; speech at Nicæa, 85; reply to Arius, 113; mother, 120; letter to bishop Macarius, 121; destruction of idolatry, 125; Church-building, 125, 127, 129; banished Eustathius, 140; imperious letter to St. Athanasius, 144; half-brother Dalmatius, 147; summoned Athanasius, 149; met by Athanasius, 152, 153; son Constantine, 154, 155; death and character, 162, 163; summary, 294; ii. 79, 151, 153, 334, 410, 533

—, forum of, at Constantinople, 128; ii. 334, 410

— II., son of Constantine the Great, 154, 155, 164, 165, 178, 399

—, Eutyician monk of Constantinople, ii. 459, 467-469

—, usurping emperor, ii. 145, 186

—, last emperor, 130

Constantinople, Constantine's choice of, 128; description of, 129; history of, 129, 130; Marcellus condemned at, 158; death of Eusebius of Nicomedia at, and consequent disturbances, 179, 180; council in year 360...280, 290; Julian, 295, 296; Valens and Catholics at, 356, 357; Catholic revival at, 408; relation to Alexandria, 410; Theodosius at, 416; second General Council, 425; canons, 437-440; session of year 382...185, 451-

453; relics at, 432, ii. 127; position of bishop of, ii. 27; Chrysostom on religious condition of, 32-35; Marcionism at, 38; jurisdiction of, 43; condition of, in 410...140; difference with Rome, 145; circular letter from Zosimus, 211; called "the city," 349; state of Church at, on death of Maximian, 386; receiving body of St. Chrysostom, 410; council in 448...445; the sojourning synod, 447, 528, 541; rights of the see, 540-548.

Constantinople, topography of (with Chalcedon), 123, 128, 129, 159, 222, 356, 457; ii. 31, 39, 40, 46, 63, 66, 74, 76, 79, 81, 86, 87, 237, 238, 334, 410, 433, 451, 504, 515. See under: baths of Anastasia, of Constantine, of Zeuxippus; churches of Anastasia, Apostles, Euphemia, Irene, John Baptist, Mocius, Paul, Peter and Paul, Sophia, Thomas (for all which see further under Churches, dedications of); forum of Arcadius, of Constantine, of Theodosius; suburbs of Anaplus, Elæa, Exokionion, Hebdomon, and across the water of Chalcedon, the Oak, Sycæ; walls of Constantine, of Theodosius II.: etc.

—, bishops of (see also under each name): Alexander, bishop before 323...67, 68; Paul, 336...161 [followed by Evagrius, 370...367]; Eusebius, 338...166; Macedonius, 342...179 [followed by Carterius...521]; Eudoxius, 360...281; Demophilus, 370...367 [followed by Marinus...521; Dorotheus...521; Barba, 407...ii. 140]; [Florentius, Eunomian, before 380...408]; Gregory, 380...410; [Maximus] the Cynic, 380...414; Nectarius, 381...433; John Chrysostom, 398...ii. 30; Arsacius, 404...ii. 87; Atticus, 406...ii. 99; Sisinnius, 425...ii. 238; Nestorius, 428...ii. 254; Maximian, 431...ii. 351; Proclus, 434...ii. 386; Flavian, 446...ii. 434; Anatolius, 449...ii. 495

Novatian episcopal succession: Acesius, before 325...80; Agelius, before 367...356; Marcian, 357; Sisinnius, before 398...ii. 38; Chrysanthus, 407 or 408...ii. 240; Paul, 419...ii. 240

Constantius, father of Constantine the Great, 3; lived at Arles, 26

—, son of Constantine the Great, 158; character, 163-165; at Antioch, 172; share in affairs at Constantinople, 180; 191; received deputies from Sardica, 122; relation to St. Athanasius, 197, 294; defeated Magnentius, 219; theological position, 230, 274, 278; called a scorpion, 285; ordered exposition on Prov. viii. 22, 291; esteemed Eusebius of Samosata, 293; summary, 294; cousin of Julian, 295; massacre at his accession, 295; made Julian Cæsar, 302; death, 302; timid and

- cruel, 304; temple destroyed in his reign, 308; 319; ii. 31, 125, 493
- Constantius, a Roman Manichean, 513
- , father of Valentinian III., ii. 225, 246
- , a priest of Antioch, ii. 89, 93
- , a Eutychian monk of Constantinople, ii. 467
- Continents (celibates), law on, 365
- Contradictur*, ii. 486
- Coptic list of bishops at Nicæa, 77, 81; account of the Council at Ephesus, ii. 311, 312; Christology of Coptic Church, ii. 519
- Cordova, bishop Hosius, 70, 80, 181
- Corinth, ii. 313, 361
- Corn from Africa to Rome, ii. 21
- Cornelius, pope, 40
- Cos. *See* Julian, bishop of
- Cossinius, bishop of Hierocæsarea, ii. 447
- Co-standers, an order of penitents, 35, 109; ii. 61
- Councils, their value, 42; St. Gregory Nazianzen on, 42, 449-451; St. Martin and, 470; Eusebius on, 42; imperial relation to, 75; composed of bishops alone, 78, 82; freedom necessary for, ii. 492, 493; criticism on their proceedings, ii. 526, 527
- Councils, list of—

(1) **Africa:**

- Bagai (Bagaia, Baga), 394 (Donatist)... 539
- Cabarsussi (Cebarsussa), 393 (Donatist)... 539
- Cæsarea in Mauritania, 418...ii. 248
- Carthage, (under Agrippinus)...212; seven under Cyprian...212; 256 (under Cyprian)...ii. 5; 311 (against Cæcilian)...18, ii. 152; 348 (under Gratus)...185, 252; 390 (under Genethlius)... 539; 397 (under Aurelius)...ii. 20, 21; June, 401...ii. 107; September, 401...ii. 109; 403...ii. 111; 404...ii. 112-114; 405...ii. 117; 407...ii. 132; 408...ii. 134; 411 (*Collatio cum Donatistis*)...ii. 147-154; 411...ii. 167, 168; 416...ii. 201; 417...ii. 209; 418...ii. 212-214, 248, 252; 419...ii. 249; 424...ii. 251, 252, 332; 525 (under Boniface)...104, ii. 252 (Carthage?), 330 (Donatist)...208
- Cirta, 305...14, 17, 18, ii. 21, 152; 412...ii. 156
- Hippo, 393...539; ii. 5, 20, 109, 110
- Milevum, 402...ii. 110, 111; 416...ii. 201, 202, 204
- (2) **Alexandria and Egypt:**
- Alexandria, 230...60; 324...70, 145; about 350...215; 362...324-333, 346, 347, 389, ii. 279, 409, 431; 363...344, 345; 399 or 400...ii. 54; (Nitria) 401...ii. 57; 430 (early)...

Councils, list of—*continued*.

- ii. 278; 430 (November)...ii. 293, 294
- (3) **Asia Minor** (for Cilicia, *see* under Syria):
- Ancyra, 314...34-37, 213; 358 (semi-Arian)...259, 264, 267, 354; 375 (Arian)...378
- Angarum or Sangarum (Novatian), 521
- Antioch in Caria, 367 (semi-Arian)... 360
- Cappadocia, 362...333
- Ephesus, 431 (Third General)...ii. 279, 297, 312-350, 356, 373, 387, 388, 396, 431, 449, 482, 525-527; 449 (Latrocinium)...458, 476, 478-493, 517-520
- Gangra, about the middle of the 4th century...260, 389
- Lampsacus, 365 (semi-Arian)...353, 354, 358, 369
- Lycia, 362...333
- Neocæsarea, 315...37-40, 213
- Nicæa, 325 (First General)...75, and *see* Nicene Council
- Nyssa, 375 (Arian)...378
- Pamphylia, 362...333; 366 (semi-Arian)...357
- Pisidia, 366 (semi-Arian)...357
- Pontus, 362...333
- Seleucia, 359 (semi-Arian)...270-274, 278, 279, 354, 409, 457
- Side in Pamphylia, 383...523
- Smyrna, 366 (semi-Arian)...357, 358
- Tyana, 367...359, 390, 406
- (4) **Balkan Peninsula:**
- Achaia, 362...333
- Dacia, 362...333
- Dalmatia, 362...333
- Illyria, 375...382
- Macedonia, 362...333
- Nice, 359 (Arian)...274
- Philippopolis, 343 (Arian)...183, 184, 190, 208, 260
- Sardica, 343...180-190, 208, 214, 216, 217, 341, ii. 78, 97, 248-253
- Sirmium, 348 (Arian)...218, 253, 267; 351 (Arian)...194, 219-221, 253, 260, 261, 267; 357 (Arian)...253, 254, 267; 358 (semi-Arian)...256, 261, 262, 267; 359 (Arian)...266, 267
- (5) **Britain:**
- London, 1075...188
- (6) **Constantinople** (including Chalcedon, etc.):
- Chalcedon, 451...104, ii. 43, 278, 279, 375, 423, 441, 470, 471, 482, 483, 487, 492, 513, 514-550
- Constantinople, 336 (against Marcellus)...158; 360 (Arian)...279-282, 290; 381 (Second General)...107, 425-430, 433-441, 453, 460, ii. 43, 470, 527, 541; 382...185, 187, 405, 447, 449, 451-453; 383...455-458, 460,

Councils, list of—*continued*.

- 524; **404**...ii. 78; **429**...ii. 276;
 "sojourning synod"...527, ii. 43,
 447, 528, 541; **448**...ii. 447-460,
 481-484, 519; **553** (Fifth General)
 ...ii. 261, 427, 428, 435, 537; **680**
 (Sixth General or Council in Trullo)
 ...ii. 549, 550
 Oak, **403**...ii. 66-72, 74, 75
 (7) **Gaul**:
 Arles, **314**...25-31, 206, 465, ii. 151,
 247; **353** (Arian)...225-228, ii. 247
 Biserræ (Beziers), **356** (Arian)...238
 Bordeaux, **384** or **385**...464
 Cologne, **346** (spurious)...216, 217
 Nismes, **394**...539
 Orange, **441**...ii. 420; **529**...ii. 233, 402
 Paris, **360**...285, 286
 Riez, **439**...ii. 419
 Valence, **374**...398
 (Vienne), **444**...ii. 420
 (8) **Italy, North**:
 Aquileia, **381**...404, 441-446, 451
 Ariminum (Rimini), **359** (Arian)...175,
 265, 267-270, 274-278, 283-286, 333,
 334, 341, 350, 351, 353, 354, 359,
 382, 398
 Italy, **362**...332; **401**?...ii. 107
 Milan, **345**...195, 217; **347**...217, 253;
355 (Arian)...228-232, 257; **364**
 (Arian)...350; **381**...404, 427; **382**
 ...446, 447; **389**...514; **390**...515
 Turin, **401**...ii. 124
 (9) **Rome, with Central and South Italy**:
 Capua, **391**...526, ii. 9
 Pisa, **1409**...ii. 538
 Rome, **313**...21-23, 206, ii. 152; **341**...
 176, 182; **366**...359, 389; **368** or **369**
 ...365; **371** or **372**...381, 382, 395;
376 or **377**...387; **378** or **380**...396;
382...453-455, 460, 463; **400**...ii.
 54; **405**...ii. 121; **430**...ii. 288, 297;
433 (spurious)...i. 127; **449**...ii. 496;
1215 (Lateran)...i. 441; **1870** (Vati-
 can)...ii. 532
 Sicily, **366**...359
 (10) **Spain**:
 Elvira (Illiberis), **305**...235, 397
 Saragossa, **380**...423, 465
 Toledo, **400**...ii. 25, 26; Fourth Council
 of, ii. 116
 (11) **Syria and Cilicia, with Palestine**:
 Anazarbus, (anti-Pelagian)...ii. 241;
433 (Nestorian)...ii. 377
 Antioch, **269**...91, 261, 325; **329** or
330...140; **341** (Dedication Council)
 ...172-176, 185, 261, 360, 465, 525,
 ii. 77, 78; **344**...192; **358** (Arian)...
 258; **361** (Acacian)...290; **361** (Ano-
 moean)...293; **363**...342, 343, 346,
 359; **379**...404, 452, 453; **431** (Nes-
 torian)...ii. 355; **445**...ii. 423, 429;
448...ii. 440

Councils, list of—*continued*.

- Cæsarea, **334**...149
 Cilicia, **423**...ii. 225
 Cyprus, **402**...ii. 62
 Diospolis (Lydda), **415**...ii. 186-190,
 199, 201, 215
 Euphratesia, **432**...ii. 365
 Jerusalem, **335**...153, 154, 195; **346**...
 199; **415**...ii. 182-184, 201
 Tarsus, **431** (Nestorian)...ii. 355
 Tyre, **335** (Arian)...149-153, 172, 465
 Cowper, 33
 Creationism, ii. 180
 Crediton, 188
 Creeds and formularies:
 Apostles' (= Roman), 176, ii. 331, 476, 497
 Gregory of Neocæsarea, c. **250**...38
 Council of Antioch against Paul, c. **270**...
 91, 261
 Alexander, Tome of, c. **321**...67, 88
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, **325**...88
 Jerusalem, 88
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, **325**...139
 Nicene Creed, **325**...88-97, 136, 249; in
 Armenia, 112; at Sardica, **343**...185;
 at Milan, **345**...195; at Milan, **355**...
 229, 230; at Ariminum, **359**...268,
 269; at Seleucia, **359**...271, 273; at
 Antioch, **363**...342, 343; at Rome,
366...359, 389; in Asia Minor, **366**...
 357-359; Athanasius, **344**, **365**, **381**, ii.
 361; Basil, **374**, **380**, **436**; Epiphanius,
373...434-436; at Constantinople, **381**
 ...434-437; Gregory, **436**; at Con-
 stantinople, **419**...437, ii. 250; in
 Africa, **419**...ii. 249; Nestorians, ii.
 285, 303, 393; Cyril, ii. 273, 278, 293,
 362, 393; at Ephesus, **431**...437, ii.
 320, 321, 330, 331, 338, 485; Orientals,
 437, ii. 330, 344, 346, 358, 361, 368,
 389; Eutyches, ii. 450, 454, 466, 468,
 481, 518; at Ephesus, **449**...ii. 485,
 486, 488; at Chalcedon, **451**...437, ii.
 518, 520, 521, 524, 525, 530, 531
 Arius and Euzoius, **330**...143
 First Antiochene (Bishops') Creed, **341**...
 174
 Second Antiochene (Lucian's) Dedication
 Creed, **341**...175, 247, 260, 261, 271-
 274, 283, 325, 360, 457
 Third Antiochene (Theophronius's) Creed,
341...175, 179
 Fourth Antiochene (Four envoys') Creed,
342 = Creed of Philippopolis, **343**...178,
 179, 184, 247, 260
 Macrosthic, **344**...194, 195, 227, 230, 247
 Cyril of Jerusalem, **347**...434-437
 First Sirmian Creed, **348**...218, 267
 Second (or long) Sirmian Creed, **351**...
 220, 230, 256, 260, 261, 267
 Third Sirmian Creed (Blasphemia), **357**
 ...253, 254, 256-259, 261, 265, 267
 Ancyra, **358** (Semi-Arian)...259, 260

Creeds and formularies—*continued.*

- Fourth Sirmian Creed, **358** (semi-Arian)
...256, 261, 267
- Fifth Sirmian (dated) Creed, **359**...266-
269, 271-274
- Seleucia, **359** (Acacian)...272, 342
- Nice, **359**...274-276
- Ariminum, **359**...276, 277, 279, 280, 283,
284, 286, 293, 324, 334, 354, 358, 359
- Antioch, **361** (Anomœan)...293
- Alexandria, Tome of, **362**...328
- Paulinus of Antioch, **363**...347
- Epiphanius, **373**. See Nicene Creed
- Auxentius of Milan, **364**...351
- Damasus, or the Westerns, Tome of, **379**=
Tome of Antioch, **379**...404, 405, 452,
453
- , anathemas of, **380**...406, 407
- Priscillian, **381**...423
- Constantinople, Tome of, **381**...433, 434,
452; Creed of, **381**...434-437, 441, ii.
250, 260, 273, 320, 358, 470, 481, 518,
520, 522, 525, 528
- Eunomius, **383**...458
- Pelagius, **417**...ii. 207
- Julian of Eclanum, **418**...ii. 221
- Nestorian (Theodore's) Creed, ii. 330, 331
- Cyril of Alexandria, Articles (Anathe-
matisms), **430**...406, ii. 294, 301, 303,
308-310, 317, 322, 326, 337, 338, 341,
344, 346-349, 353-355, 359, 361, 363-
367, 369, 376-378, 435, 439, 442, 449,
482, 492, 520, 531
- Nestorius, counter-anathemas of, **430**...
ii. 301-303
- Reunion, Formulary of, **432**...ii. 338, 366,
368-370, 373, 374, 377, 380-385, 450,
455, 471
- Proclus, Tome of, **435**...ii. 390, 391
- Flavian, Formulary of, **449**...ii. 470, 471,
519
- Leo, Tome of, **449**...ii. 472-475, 477, 503,
505, 518, 520-522, 525, 527, 529, 532,
535, 548
- Chalcedon, Formulary or Definition of,
451...i. 452, ii. 207, 278, 450, 470, 471,
521, 528-532, 537, 541
- Quicumque*, 91, 189, 410, 411, 417, 443,
447, 452, ii. 207, 331, 381, 398
- Creighton, bishop (of London), ii. 116
- Crescentius, controversy with bishop Alex-
ander, 56
- Cresconius, a criminal, ii. 13
- , Donatist, ii. 22, 117
- , monk of Hadrumetum, ii. 227
- Crete, 64, 454
- Criminals, released by episcopal intercession,
ii. 11, 13; by clerics, 533
- Crispinus, Donatist bishop of Calama, ii. 112
- , Donatist presbyter of Calama, ii. 112
- Crispus, son of Constantine, 45, 120
- Critobulus, heretic in St. Jerome's *Dialogues*,
ii. 181
- Cross, supposed discovery of the true, 122
- Otesiphon, 203
- , correspondent of Jerome, ii. 180
- Cucusus, 223; ii. 89, 91, 104
- Culcianus, a persecutor in Egypt, 9
- Cummian, Celtic scholar, ii. 414
- Curia Julia, at Rome, 470
- Curia, *Curiales*, 47, 49, 198, 208, 308, 313,
503, 509; ii. 45, 121, 123, 242. See also
Decurion
- Curiosus*, meaning of, ii. 73
- Cursus publicus*, 25, 47, 196, 307
- Cybele, 317; ii. 124, 136
- Cyclops, ii. 69
- Cynegius, prætorian prefect, 529
- Cyprian, St., 16, 17, 27, 29, 212, 213, 255,
331; ii. 5, 9, 44, 151, 161, 174, 214, 223,
322, 389, 397, 405, 533, 542
- Cyprus, 79, 329, 428, 460, 524; ii. 42, 58,
62, 63, 197, 256, 313, 325, 331, 332.
See also under Epiphanius
- Cyrene, ii. 141-143
- Cyriacus, deacon and papal representative
at Arles, 28
- , deacon, bearer of letter to Chrysostom,
ii. 101
- , bishop and envoy of the council of
Constantinople (382), 452
- , bishop of Synnada, ii. 95, 101
- , bishop of Heraclea, ii. 544
- Cyril, St., of Alexandria, on life of St.
Athanasius, 116, ii. 272; nephew of
Theophilus, ii. 190, 341; Novatians, 191;
Jews, 191, 192; Orestes, 194; Hypatia,
194, 195; mellowing of his spirit, 244,
245; on Eusebius of Dorylæum, 265;
Dorylæum, 265; the Nestorian contro-
versy, Cyril and Nestorius, 272-275, 278-
284; and Rome, 286-289; and Antioch,
291; Council of Alexandria, 293-297;
before the Council of Ephesus, 308-312; at
the Council, 313-332; after the Council,
335-344, 351; reunion with the Orientals,
359-379; reassures his friends, 379-385;
final results, 388-394; St. Chrysostom,
410; St. Leo, 421, 422; closing years,
422-424; estimate of him, 424-426; 428,
429, 434, 435, 442, 443, 446, 447; at
Constantinople in 448...449; at the La-
trocinium, 482, 492; at Chalcedon, 517,
518, 520, 521, 522, 525, 532, 533, 534,
536, 539, 542
- St. Cyril's writings in the Nestorian
controversy: Encyclical to the monks of
Egypt, 272, 273; First letter to Nestorius,
274; Second letter to Nestorius, 278, 279,
287, 320, 449, 482, 520, 522, 525, 531,
532; letter to a friend, 280; to his
apocrisiarii at Constantinople, 280; On
the Right Faith, to Theodosius (=Dia-
logue on the Incarnation of the Only-
Begotten), 282; To the princesses Arcadia
and Marina, 282, 382; To the princesses

Pulcheria and Eudocia, 283; letter to pope Celestine, 286; to Acacius of Berœa, 287; to John of Antioch, 291; to Juvenal of Jerusalem, 292; Third letter to Nestorius (with the Twelve Articles, Chapters, or Anathemas), 293-296, and *see* under Creeds and Formularies; to the clergy and laity, and to the monks, of Constantinople, 296; Defence of the Twelve Chapters against the Orientals, 308, 369; Against Theodoret, 309; Reply to the blasphemies of Nestorius, 310; letter to Celestine, 311; Extracts from Nestorius's sermons, 313, 323; Sermons at Ephesus, 314, 335; letters to the Church of, and to the Egyptian bishops at, Constantinople, 339; Explanation of the Twelve Articles, 341, 369; letter to Maximian of Constantinople, 356; Defence to Theodosius, 359; letter to Acacius of Berœa, 362-367; to pope Sixtus, 362; to the court, 372; letter to John of Antioch (*Lætentur cæli*), 374-379, 449, 482, 492, 519; to Acacius of Melitene, 380, 482; to Eulogius, 381; to Valerian of Iconium, 382, 482; to Succensus (Succensus) of Diocæsarea, 382, 482; to Aristolaus, 389; to Maximus, 390; to John of Antioch, 390; to the Orientals, 392; On the holy Symbol, 393; *Quod unus est Christus*, 382; letter to Proclus of Constantinople, 393; Scholia (on the Incarnation of the Only-Begotten), 522

Other writings of St. Cyril: Reply to Julian's work against the Christians, i. 315; Paschal (Festal) letters, ii. 272, 363; On the Holy Trinity, 275; letter to pope Leo concerning Easter, 422; to Domnus of Antioch, 422, 423; to Martinian, 423; to bishop Calosyrus, 424

Cyril, St., of Jerusalem, 122, 248, 258, 270, 273, 274, 281, 316, 358, 425, 434, 437, 481, 482; ii. 263, 408

—, a deacon of Heliopolis, 308

Cyrinus, bishop of Chalcedon, ii. 65, 78

Cyrrhos (Cyrus), 405; ii. 242, 407; *see* Theodoret

Cyrus, bishop of Berœa, 140

—, bishop of Tyre, ii. 241, 344

—, presbyter of Edessa, ii. 436, 440, 441

Cyzicus, 286, 354, 390; ii. 238. *See* also under bishops Eleusius, Eunomius, Proclus, Diogenes

D

Dacia, 333, 407, 454; ii. 145

Dale, Dr. R. W., 72, 75, 94; ii. 259

Dalmatia, 301, 333

Dalmatius, abbot at Constantinople, ii. 239, 325, 334, 341, 372, 433

—, half-brother of Constantine, 147

Dalmatius, the younger, son of the above, 147

—, a tribune at Milan, 489

Damascius, heathen writer, ii. 195

—, a tribune, judges Ibas, ii. 441

Damascus, 309, 523

Damasine inscriptions, 475

Damasus, pope, priest, 262; pope, 362; character, 363, 364; 377; Basil, 381, 383; action on Antiochene schism, 386; accused by Isaac, a Jew, 395; his synodical Tome, 404, 405; synod against Macedonianism, 406; Maximus, 414; edict of Theodosius, 415; appeal of Priscillian, 423; 451; appeal to civil power, 475; encouragement of architecture, art, and literature, 364, 475-477; writings, 476; death, 478; erects vicariate of Thessalonica, 407, 454, ii. 96, 197. *See* also Councils (Roman)

Dancing, ii. 76, 77, 133

Daniel, Egyptian bishop, ii. 296, 335

—, bishop of Carrhæ, ii. 440, 441, 490

—, priest, informant of Cyril, ii. 390

—, the prophet, ii. 341

Dante, 26

Danube, 280, 383, 387; ii. 38

Daphne, 319; ii. 39, 93

Darius, an imperial officer, ii. 305

Dated Creed, 267; new edition of, 274: *see* under Creeds

Dativus, an African martyr, 13

Dauphiny, 80

David, 517; ii. 67, 476

—, a deacon of Edessa, ii. 442

Day of Splendour (Easter Day), ii. 80

Daza. *See* Maximin

Deacons forbidden to offer Eucharist, 29; number restricted, 40

Decani, 484

Decurion, a provincial town councillor, 47, 307; ii. 242

Dedication, festival at Jerusalem, 153, ii. 58, 185; council at Antioch, 172

Defensor, a Gallic bishop, 400

Delator, 310

Delos, ii. 479

Delphi, 129

Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, 465; ii. 124

Demetrias, a Roman lady, ii. 177, 178, 182

Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, 61, 118

—, bishop of Pessinus, ii. 68, 96, 101, 102

Demophilus, bishop of Berœa in Thrace, 195, 256, 268; translated to Constantinople, 367, 418, 457, 521

Demosthenes, imperial cook, 373, 378

Deogratias, bishop of Carthage, ii. 111, 406

Departed, prayers for the, 524, ii. 132. *See* Diptychs

Desiderius, bishop of Langres, ii. 125

Despotes, in Theodore's Christology, ii. 260

Deus creator omnium, 492

- Dianius, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 172, 284
- Dichu, Irish chief, ii. 417
- Dictinius, Spanish bishop, ii. 26
- Didymus, a priest of Alexandria, 242
- , theologian of Alexandria, 338, 478, 481
- Dies iræ*, 506; ii. 259
- Dill, Professor, 297, 471; ii. 24
- Diocæsarea, 377
- Diocesan episcopacy, 28, 99, 109, 255, 406; ii. 9, 132, 148
- Diocese, civil meaning of, 29, 30, 396, 437; normal ecclesiastical meaning of, 107, 407, 437, 438, ii. 43, 529, 541, 544; a more restricted meaning of, 30
- Diocletian, emperor, 1, 2, 6, 12, 29, 50, 63, 163, 203, 300, 306
- Diodore, of Antioch, bishop of Tarsus, 198, 251, 291; ordained priest, 374, 375; bishop, 405, 425, 433, 434, 440, 454; ii. 260, 382, 390
- Diogenes, bishop in Syria, ii. 430
- , bishop of Cyzicus, ii. 487, 489, 492, 518, 544
- , imperial messenger, 239
- Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, 55, 57, 118; accepted Homoousion, 91; on Easter, 101; 178; use of Gloria Patri, 197; ii. 22
- , bishop of Milan, 228–233, 349, 350, 386
- , pope, 178, 291, 381
- , a count, at council of Tyre, 150–152
- , Exiguus, 104; ii. 546
- , Filocalus, sculptor at Rome, 475
- , tyrant of Syracuse, 163
- Dioscuros (Dioscorus), bishop of Alexandria, ii. 428, 429, 437, 445, 460, 471, 472, 516–520, 522–524, 526, 527, 529
- Dioscurus, a Libyan bishop, ii. 68
- , a Tall Brother, bishop of Hermopolis, ii. 55–57, 72
- Diospolis (Lydda), ii. 186, 199, 215
- Diptychs, ii. 145, 196, 197, 244, 372, 409, 423
- Discorus, befriended St. Chrysostom, ii. 91
- Diu, 243
- Divio (Die), 80
- Division of empire, 29, 163, 164, 178, 349, 407, 463; ii. 1
- Docetists, 327; ii. 432
- Dodona, 129
- Dolicha, 405
- Döllinger, Dr., 237, 262
- Domine, quo vadis?* 495
- Dominica, wife of Valens, 374
- Dominicans, on grace, ii. 228
- Domitian, emperor, 49, 164
- Domitianus, church steward of Constantinople, ii. 96
- Domninus, Palestinian bishop, ii. 430
- Domnus II., bishop of Antioch, ii. 422, 423, 427–430, 434, 436, 437, 439–441, 443, 445, 467, 479, 480, 487, 490–492, 498, 524, 534, 540
- Domnus, bishop of Stridon, 80
- Domus Faustæ, 21, 126
- Donation of Constantine, the true, 21, 127
- Donatism, origins of, 11–19, 206; appeal to Constantine, 20–25, 31–33, 206; council of Arles, 25–28; temper and ideals of, 33, 207, ii. 157, 158, 164; Donatus the Great, i. 207–209; measures of Constantine against, 32, 207, 210, 212; of Constans, 212, 214, 334; re-baptism among Donatists, 208, 395, 396, 540, ii. 22, 112, 114, 117, 135, 151; eucharist, 212, 336; Donatism in Rome, 208, 395–397; Arians and, 208, ii. 22; Donatist outrages, 210, 211, 334–336, ii. 112, 113, 117, 118, 134, 135, 154, 155; the first Union, i. 209–214; under Julian, 323, 334–336; schism within, 393–399, ii. 4, 109; African councils and, 540, ii. 107–112; Augustine and, 330, ii. 5, 6, 21, 22, 110, 113, 115, 116, 135, 147, 155–157; appeals to Honorius, ii. 113, 114, 118, 134, 135, 146, 157; laws against, 114–118, 135, 146, 154, 255; conference with Catholics, 411–416; its result, 153–157; summary, 157, 158; Vincent of Lerins on, 397
- Donatus, African bishop, 335
- , Donatist bishop of Bagai, 210, 211
- , the elder, bishop of Casæ Nigræ, 16, 20, 22
- , African bishop and traditor, 14
- , the Great, 20, 33, 207; his subordinationism, 208, 209
- Dorchester, 188
- Dormitantius (Vigilantius), ii. 126
- Dorner, 288
- Dorostorum in Thrace, 311
- Dorotheus, a deacon of Antioch, 381, 382, 385
- , Arian bishop of Antioch and Constantinople, 404, 521, ii. 140
- , Nestorianizing bishop of Marcianopolis, ii. 275, 287, 300, 358, 359
- , a martyr at Nicomedia, 10
- Doxology, 38, 197, 198, 392, ii. 105, 273
- Drypia, ii. 39
- Duchesne, 80, 126, 407, 515; ii. 253
- Dunbarton, ii. 415

E

- Easter, method of fixing: early centuries, 101; discussed at Arles, 28; at Alexandria, 56, 70, 142; at Nicea, 102; Celtic usage, 101; at Antioch, 173; at Sardica, 188; among the Novatians, 521, 522; in Africa, ii. 109; Leo and Cyril, ii. 421
- Easter Eve, ii. 17, 40, 71, 79, 127
- Ebionism, 68, 94, 406; ii. 256, 266
- Ebrius, bishop of York, 27

- Ecclesia non est quæ non habet sacerdotes*, 331
- Ecclesiastical organisation, follows the civil, 103, 390, 437; principle rejected at Rome, 407, 454, ii. 197; at Chalcedon, ii. 539
- Ecclesiasticus, ii. 130
- Ecdicius, prefect of Egypt, 322
- Eclanum (*Œculanum*), ii. 220. *See* Julian
- Edessa, 196, 201, 308, 375, 523; ii. 244, 355
- Education under Julian, 313
- Egypt, persecution in, 10; bishops who signed Alexander's Tome, 67; at Nicæa, 78, 104; Meletius in, 104; extent of, 105; bishops in, 118; obelisk, 128; monasticism, 131; linen tax, 145; corn-grants, 165; Sardican letter to, 189; destruction of the temples, 529-532; Christology, ii. 526, 549
- Egyptian calendar: Pauni, 116; Paophi, 199; Mechir, 321, ii. 279; Mesori, ii. 340; Athyr, ii. 351
- Egyptian "Church Ordinances," 118
- Elæa, a suburb of Constantinople, ii. 238
- Elbe, ii. 304
- Elephantine, frontier town, ii. 411
- Eleusinius, monk and deacon, ii. 452, 467, 485
- Eleusis, sanctuary of, 301
- Eleusius, semi-Arian bishop of Cyzicus, 260, 270, 273, 274, 281, 286, 354, 457, 520
- , a Donatist, ii. 21
- Eleutheropolis, 542
- Eliakim, ii. 356
- Elijah, 524; ii. 67, 341
- Elisha, 410, 497; ii. 67
- , a Nestorian bishop, ii. 359
- Elmham, 188
- Elpidius, an Illyrian bishop, 382
- , bishop of Syrian Laodicea, ii. 78, 102
- , a Roman priest, 169, 170
- , a count under Julian, 311, 320
- , count at the *Latrocinium*, ii. 472, 479, 480, 482, 486
- , a missionary priest in Syria, ii. 94
- , a Spanish rhetorician, 423
- Elvira (*Illiberis*), 235, 285, 397
- Embrun, ii. 420
- Emerita in Spain, 27
- Emeritus, an African confessor, 13
- Emesa, 309, and *see* under bishop Paul
- Emmanuel, archimandrite at Constantinople, ii. 497
- Empire, division of, 29, 163, 164, 178, 349, 407, 463; ii. 1; organization of, *see* under Diocese and Prefecture
- Encænna* of the Resurrection at Jerusalem, 153, ii. 58, 185; council in *Encænna* at Antioch, 173
- Enceladus, 420
- Encratism, 37, 524
- Endowment of churches by Constantine, 21, 127
- Enlightenment, a name for baptism, 39
- Ennathas, a Palestinian martyr, 10
- Enthusiasts (*Messalians*), ii. 240
- Eparchies, provinces of the Empire, 103
- Ephesius, Luciferian bishop of Rome, 475
- Ephesus, 79, 107, 125, 350; Chrysostom and, ii. 43-45, 93; council of, 297; the bishops meet, 311-318; first session, 318; second session, 327; third session, 328; fourth and fifth sessions, 329; letters from council, 329, 330; sixth session, 330; decision on Nicene Creed, 331; seventh session, 331; minor points and canons, 331, 332; influences at court, 334; arrival of count John, 335; formulary of reunion, 338; state of affairs at close, 353; Pelagianism, 403; council of, 449...458, 476, 479-493, 518, 534-539; disputed elections to the see, 537-539; relation of the see to Constantinople, 539, 541, 542. *See* also under bishops Menophantus, Antoninus, Heraclides, Memnon, Basil, Bassian, Stephen
- Epictetus, bishop of Centumcellæ, 233, 236, 268
- , bishop of Corinth, ii. 361, and *see* under Athanasius
- Epicureans, ii. 14
- Epipa, a city in Lydia, ii. 489
- Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, on bishop Meletius, 54, 55; on parochial system, 55; on Alexander's letters, 66; on number of Nicene bishops, 77; on misconstruction of Homocousion, 91; on Easter controversy, 100; his Meletian stories, 115; on Alexander's successor, 116; story of a converted Jew, 124; on St. Athanasius and the civil power, 144; on St. Athanasius and Marcellus, 218; on Aetius, 245; on the *Anomœans*, 252; on the *Homœans*, 253; on Hosius, 254; on Ancyran council, 259; on Arian craft, 272; on Seleucia, 272; on Meletius of Antioch, 290; on his sermon, 292; on heresies, 330; the Creeds in his *Ancoratus*, 434; bishop of Salamis, 454; on followers of Helvidius, 523; on Origenism, 541, 542, ii. 4, 49, 51, 52, 59, 62-64; death and character, 65; 69-71, 89, 182, 192, 538
- , archdeacon of Alexandria, ii. 372, 433
- , bishop of Perga, ii. 485
- , a cleric of Constantinople, 452
- Epiphany, Festival of the, 288, 302, 373
- Epirus, 454
- Equitius, an African bishop, ii. 109, 110
- Esdras, apocryphal book of, ii. 127
- Esquiline at Rome, 362
- Eternal, meaning, ii. 179, 186
- Ethelbert, king of Kent, 163; ii. 116
- Ethiopia, 215, 242
- Ethnarch (*Genarch*), ii. 193
- Etna, 420

- Euarestus**, a translator at Constantinople, ii. 250
- Eucharist**, terms for: the synaxis, ii. 349; the gifts, ii. 44; the oblation, 152, ii. 276, 346; the oblations, 146, 207; the sacrifice, 183, 212, ii. 25, 492; the bloodless service, ii. 294; the Holy Things, ii. 79; the mysteries, i. 395, 413, 527, ii. 387; the mystical table, ii. 359; the symbols of the mysteries, ii. 57; the mystic symbols of the Saviour's Passion, i. 9; the cup of salvation, 17; the mass (*missa*), 485; the Body and Blood, ii. 502; the Body of the Lord, 183, 332, ii. 17, 125, 424; the Blood of Christ, 335, ii. 79, 125; Christ Himself, 239; (of deathbed communion), the Viaticum, 109, ii. 17, 123
- Church rules about the Eucharist: infants, ii. 204; catechumens, i. 152; penitents, 29, 35, 109; sick and dying, 29, 109, ii. 105, 276; confession, 527; fasting, ii. 20, 70, 71, 105; absence from, 173; attendance without communion, ii. 25; communion once or twice a year, ii. 34
- The Eucharistic service: place of, ii. 276; time of, 513, ii. 491; frequency of, daily, ii. 25; Sunday and Saturday, 134, 244, 540, ii. 57; on special occasions, councils, 153, 229, episcopal consecrations, ii. 491; ministers of, 29; vestments for, 134, ii. 70, 105; the opening benediction, ii. 44; the sermon, i. 212; the liturgy of the faithful, 152, ii. 44; the kiss of peace, ii. 184; the prayers, 336, ii. 184; the episcopal benediction, ii. 201; the invocation, ii. 432; the mixed chalice, ii. 20; relics in connexion with, 17, ii. 127; the diptychs, ii. 145, 196, 197, 244, 372
- Reception of the Eucharist implying communion, 153, 212, 351, ii. 51, 184, 275; refusal of, implying breach of communion, 253, ii. 93, 99, 276; sacrilegious insults to (generally implying non-recognition of validity), 146, 168, 183, 239, 335, 413, ii. 79, 125; reservation of the sacrament, ii. 17, 57, 79, 424
- The Fathers on the Eucharist: Hilary, 239; Optatus, 17, 335; Chrysostom, ii. 79; Jerome, ii. 125; Cyril of Alexandria, ii. 294, 342, 424, 501; Theodoret, ii. 432, 433; Leo, ii. 502
- The Eucharist in the sects: Donatist service same as Catholic, 212, 336; Manicheans, 512, 513; Euchites, 522; Artotyrites, 524; Priscillianists, ii. 25
- Eucherius**, son of Stilicho, ii. 134
- , bishop of Lyons, ii. 247
- Euchites**, 522; ii. 348. *See also* Messalians
- Euchrocia**, a Priscillianist, 467
- Eudæmon**, a Meletian bishop, 145
- Eudocia**, wife of Theodosius II., ii. 237, 283
- Eudoxia**, Empress, ii. 28, 38, 39, 42, 47; feeling against St. Chrysostom, 48, 65; 64, 71; obtained St. Chrysostom's recall, 73, 74; statue of, 76; Herodias, 77; again hostile, 78; death, 95
- , Licinia, wife of Valentinian III., ii. 500
- Eudoxius**, successively bishop of Antioch, Germanicia, and Constantinople, 139, 181, 195, 219; bearer of a letter to Eusebius of Vercellæ, 228; 232, 256–258, 270, 274, 278, 281, 283, 286, 341; influence on Valens, 353, 354, 371; 360; death, 367; the Eudoxians, 520, 521
- Euethius**, a priest and companion of St. Chrysostom, ii. 91, 101
- Eugenius**, deacon and papal representative at Arles, 28
- , bishop of Heraclea, ii. 68, 94
- , master of the palace at Milan, 180
- , usurping emperor, 536, 537; ii. 136
- Euhemerus**, librarian to Julian, 302
- Euippius**, an Arian bishop, 371
- Eulalius**, bishop of Amasea, 406
- , Arian bishop of Antioch, 141, 250
- , a slave at Constantinople, ii. 69
- Eulogizæ**, ii. 434
- Eulogius**, bishop of Edessa, 375, 405
- , bishop of Cæsarea, ii. 186
- , priest at Constantinople, ii. 381
- , priest at Edessa, ii. 436, 440
- , deacon of Constantinople, ii. 441, 442
- , secretary of state, ii. 472, 479, 480, 486
- Eulysius**, bishop of Apamea, ii. 67, 68, 96, 101, 102
- Eumalius**, vicarius of the African provinces, 32
- Eunomius**, a bishop sent from Rome to Africa, 23
- , bishop of Cyzicus, 251, 262, 286, 288, 342, 367; described, 457; banished, 459, 521, ii. 30, 127, 240; followers, 403, ii. 38, 239, 242, 254, 255, 299
- , bishop of Nicomedia, ii. 539
- , Arian bishop of Samosata, 378
- Euoptyus**, bishop and friend of Cyril, ii. 309, 343
- Euphemia**, St., virgin and martyr, ii. 515
- Euphrates**, bishop of Cologne, 192, 216
- river, 44, 78, 378
- Euphratesia**, ii. 38, 242, 365, 377
- Euphratun**, bishop and correspondent of Eusebius, 66
- Euphronius**, priest of Cappadocian Cæsarea and Arian bishop of Antioch, 141
- Eupsychius**, martyr under Julian, 311
- Eusebia**, wife of Constantius, 263, 301
- Eusebian party** at Nicæa, 83, 85, 86
- Eusebius**, a bishop sent from Constantinople to the West, 452
- , a Lydian bishop, ii. 43, 44,
- , bishop of Ancyra, ii. 437, 479, 487, 491, 492, 520, 547

Eusebius, bishop of Bologna, 397, 442

—, bishop of Cæsarea, on Daza, 2; calls Miltiades Melchiades, 2; on churches, 8; his "Dedication" sermon, 9; on Palestinian Christians, 10; eye-witness of sacrilege, 12; his version of Constantine's letter to Marcus, 20; preserves Constantine's letter to Chrestus, 26; cites an anti-Montanist, 34; on councils, 42; on Licinian persecution, 43; eulogy on Constantine, 46; on Friday, 48; on Christian hopes, 48; on Christian governorships, 49; on overthrow of temples, 50; on edict to provincials of the East, 50, 51; sheltered Arius, 61, 65; letter from Alexander, 62; his doctrinal position, 65, 66, 97, 138, 139, 170; letter to Euphratius, 66; blamed by Alexander, 67; Constantine's letter to Alexander and Arius, 68; on Constantine at Nicæa, 84, 85; his creed, 88; quotes Anatolius on Easter, 101, 102; on number of Nicene bishops, 77; on Nicene council, 78; at Nicæa, 78, 97; on close of Nicene council, 110; on Meletian affairs, 115; on Constantine's exploration in Palestine, 120–123; his Theophania, 122; on death of St. Helena, 124; on Constantine's destruction of idolatry, 125; on Constantianople, 128, 129; accused by Eustathius, 139; at Jerusalem conference, 140; proposed for Antioch, 141; on magic, 147; taunted by Potammon, 149; on "Dedication" at Jerusalem, 153; summoned by Constantine, 154; attacked by Marcellus, 157, 158; baptized Constantine, 162; death and "Confession," 170; on Constantine's Church at Antioch, 172; 177; on Abgar's letter, 201; on Persia, 202; on non-scriptural terms, 249; on Prov. viii. 22–291; on Edessa, ii. 244; used the term "Theotocos," ii. 263; on Ebionites and Theodotus, ii. 266; his *History* translated by Rufinus, ii. 305

—, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 356; at Tyana, 359; relation to Basil, 369; death, 370

—, bishop of Chalcis, 405

—, bishop of Dorylæum, ii. 265, 446, 447, 449–464, 479, 481, 486, 487, 498, 506, 517, 518, 520, 545, 547

—, bishop of Nicomedia and then of Constantinople, adviser of Constantine, 44, 68; friend of Arius, 62; letter to Paulinus of Tyre, 65, 90; embittered by Alexander, 67; at Nicæa, 79, 85, 86, 97, 98, 139; displeased Constantine, 119; recalled, 136–139; opposed by Eutropius, 141; animosity against St. Athanasius, 144, 149; summoned by Constantine, 154; attacked by Marcellus, 157; threatened Alexander of Byzantium, 159; opposed bishop Paul, 161; impressed Constantius, 164, 165; action of

his party, 169–173; death and character, 179; consecrated Ulphilas, 280; educated Julian, 295

Eusebius, bishop of Pelusium, ii. 423

—, bishop of Samosata, 291, 293, 370, 378, 391, 405

—, bishop of Vercellæ, 226, 232, 285, 323, 328, 329, 331, 397; ii. 15

—, minister of Constantius, 163, 233

—, a consul in 359...266

—, a deacon of Constantinople, ii. 84

—, an advocate, correspondent of Theodoret, ii. 438

—, a papal messenger, ii. 54

—, a neoplatonist, 297

—, one of the Tall Brothers, ii. 55, 56

Eustathius, a bishop at an Illyrian Council, 382

—, bishop of Antioch, on number of Nicene bishops, 77; at Nicæa, 78, 80, 85, 87, 94, 107, 139; translated to Antioch from Berea, 138; accused of Sabellianism, 139; 177; banished to Thrace, 140; his followers, 197, 324, 328, ii. 39, 196

—, bishop of Berytus, ii. 441, 443, 479, 482, 490, 491, 505, 519, 520, 528, 534, 536

—, bishop of Sebaste, 260, 270, 274, 278, 281, 290, 357, 358, 360, 369, 389, 390, 524

—, bishop of Sidon, ii. 332

Eustochium, lady friend of Jerome, 478, 481

Eustorgius, bishop of Milan, 79

Eutherius, bishop of Tyana, ii. 359, 365, 378

Euthymius, one of the Tall Brothers, ii. 55, 56

Eutropius, chamberlain, ii. 28, 38, 40–42, 69

—, a chanter of Constantinople, ii. 87

—, bishop of Hadrianople, 141

—, a Macedonian priest of Constantinople, 521; ii. 239

—, a messenger, ii. 451

Eutyches, ii. 164, 334; first historical mention of, 372; not a theologian, 433; accused of Apollinarianism, 434; supported accusers of Ibas, 440; in year 448...445–449; summoned to council at Constantinople, 450; 451–454; attendance and condemnation, 455–460; his exact position, 460, 461; consequences of the council, 462–464; appeal for general council, 466; petitions for inquiry, 467–469; at Latrocinium, 479, 481–485; 494, 506; Leo on, 507, 509; at Chalcedon, 518, 519

Eutychianism, condemned by anticipation by St. Cyril, ii. 384; truth to be defended against, 414; its rise, 430–432; Theodoret on, 432, 433; its success, 437–445; the Council of Constantinople, 446–462; Leo on, 463–465, 472–477; at the Latrocinium, 482, 483; the "breviculus," 489; associated with Manicheanism, 501, 517; view of the Coptic Church, 519; the Council of Chalcedon, 528–532

Eutychianus of Thessalonica, 188
 Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, 117, 118
 —, a Eunomian, 521; ii. 239
 Euzoios, an adherent of Arius, 61, 143;
 made bishop of Antioch, 293; baptized
 Constantius, 302; 320, 324, 341, 377
 Evagrius, Eustathian bishop of Antioch,
 525-527; ii. 39, 196
 —, bishop of Constantinople, 367, 408
 —, Church historian, ii. 141, 315, 411, 504,
 515, 521, 534
 —, prefect of Egypt, 532
 Evasa, ii. 538
 Evodius, bishop of Uzala, ii. 114, 180, 227
 —, prætorian prefect, 466, 467
 Exarch, 107, 378, 437; of Cappadocian
 Cæsarea, 370, ii. 313; of Thracian Hera-
 clea, 439, ii. 240; of Ephesus, ii. 312,
 326; of Antioch, ii. 442
 Exeter, 188
Exhomologesis, ii. 12
 Exokionion (Exokionium), suburb of Con-
 stantinople, ii. 46, 334
 Exorcists, 28
 Expositor, Theodore the, ii. 161, 390, 392,
 436
 Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, ii. 122, 125
 Ezekiel, 207, 517

F

Fabiola, friend of St. Jerome, ii. 123
 Fabius, a Pelagianizing bishop, ii. 221, 276
 Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, ii. 317, 493
 Fall, the, ii. 181, 201
 Fasir, a Circumcellion, 210
 Fasting, teaching on, 142, 423, 513-515,
 524; before communion, ii. 20, 71; after
 Pentecost, ii. 147
 Fathers, appeal to: in the Arian contro-
 versy, i. 73, 273, 456; for and against the
 term "Homoeousion," 91, 97; by Pelagius,
 ii. 176; against Pelagius, ii. 223; against
 Nestorius, ii. 257; for the "Theotocos,"
 ii. 263; by a Roman synod, ii. 288; by
 the Council of Ephesus, ii. 322, 399;
 against the Cyrilline articles, ii. 348;
 by John of Antioch, ii. 389; in defence
 of Theodore, ii. 392; by Eusebius of
 Dorylæum, ii. 447; at Chalcedon, by
 Dioscorus, ii. 520; by the imperial com-
 missioners, ii. 520; by bishop Cecropius,
 ii. 521
 Fausta, wife of Constantine, 21
 —, the basilica of, at Milan, 229, 496
 Faustæ, Domus. *See* Lateran
 Faustinus, Roman Luciferian, on Liberius,
 257; memorial to Theodosius, 331, 475,
 510
 —, bishop of Potentia, ii. 248-252
 Faustus, abbot at Constantinople, ii. 476,
 497, 502, 513

Faustus the Manichean, 493; ii. 24, 131
 Favorinus, a "sophist" of Arles, 26
 Felicissimus, a general of Constantius, 223
 Felicitas, St., African martyr, ii. 405
 Felix, local saint of Nola, 539; ii. 4, 139
 —, martyr at Milan, 229, 496
 —, African bishop and martyr, 12, 13
 —, bishop of Aptunga, 17, 23-25, 33, 206;
 ii. 21, 153
 —, anti-pope, 236, 362, 364
 —, bishop of Treves, 469, 515, 516; ii. 124
 —, deacon of Carthage, 16
 —, Donatist fanatic, 335
 —, Manichean in Africa, ii. 131
 —, name of two monks of Hadrumetum,
 ii. 227
 —, apostate officer under Julian, 311, 320
 Festal epistles of St. Athanasius, 142, 165,
 168, 169, 170; of St. Cyril, ii. 272, 363
 Finlay, 472; ii. 237
 Firmus, bishop of Cæsarea, ii. 240, 301,
 313, 319, 343, 354, 359, 367, 410, 411
 Flacilla, Empress, 458, 504
 Flacillus, Arian bishop of Antioch, 141, 149,
 172
 Flavia Domitilla, 49
 Flavian, bishop of Antioch, 198, 251, 291;
 ordained priest, 374, 375; 404; bishop,
 429, 451, 523, 526; ii. 4, 39, 82, 196, 260,
 299
 —, bishop of Constantinople, 436; ii. 434,
 440, 441, 446-475, 480-482, 484-488, 489,
 497, 505-507, 518, 519, 527, 532
 —, an Alexandrian, ii. 274
 —, bishop of Philippi, ii. 289, 313, 319,
 343
 —, prefect of Egypt, 355
 —, prætorian prefect of Italy, 537
 Fleury, ii. 26, 157, 159, 182
 Florence, ii. 120
 Florentius, Eunomian bishop of Constanti-
 nople, 408
 —, bishop of Puteoli, 395
 —, lay assessor at council of 448, ii. 455,
 457, 459, 460, 467-469
 —, bishop of Sardis, ii. 447, 491, 505,
 521, 544
 —, a Western bishop and correspondent
 of Theodoret, ii. 500
 Florus, an attendant on Chrestus at Arles, 28
 —, a Pelagianizing bishop, ii. 221, 276
 —, monk of Hadrumetum, ii. 227
 Foclut, in Ireland, ii. 416
Folles (3000 folles = £18,000), 8
 Form of a servant, St. Hilary on, 238
 Fortunatian, bishop of Aquileia, 195, 255
 Fortunatus, a Manichean, ii. 5, 131
 Fortune, pagan image of, 309; temple of,
 311
 Fortune-tellers, ii. 34
 Fortunius, Donatist bishop of Tubursica, ii.
 21, 22
 Forum. *See* Rome and Constantinople

Franks, the, 307, 536
 Frederick II. of Prussia, 43, 309
 Freewill, ii. 159
 Friday, 48, 240
 Frigidus, river near Aquileia, 537
 Fritigern, Gothic chief, 379, 387
 Fritigil, queen of the Marcomanni, ii. 13
 Fritila (Fritilas), bishop of Heraclea, ii. 240, 332
 Fundanus, an African bishop, 13
 Funeral psalm, ii. 106
 Furni, in Africa, 13
 Fussala, near Hippo, ii. 251, 252

G

Gabala, ii. 45
 Gainas, a Goth, ii. 3. 41-44, 515
 Gaiseric, 388; ii. 138, 231, 304, 403, 404, 406
 Galata (Galates), son of Valens, 374
 Galatia, 34, 78, 317, 524; ii. 192
 Galatius, a traditor of letters of salutation, 24
 Galerius, emperor, true originator of last persecution, 1; death, 2, 182; and Licinius, 4, 41; and Maximin, 4, 7; his policy, 7, 304; ii. 515
 Galileans, Julian's name for Christians, 303, 304
 Galla, sister of Valentinian II., 508
 Galla Placidia, ii. 139, 246, 500, 501
 Gallienus, emperor, edict of, 7
 Gallinaria, 399
 Gallula Roma, Arles, 26
 Gallus Cæsar, 262, 295, 300, 301, 319
 Gamaliel, Jewish patriarch, ii. 193
 Gangra, 79, 260, 389
 Garbia, 208
 Gargilian Baths at Carthage, ii. 147
 Garnier, ii. 264, 271, 273, 285
 Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, 538; ii. 4, 98
 —, bishop of Naïssus, 184, 186
 —, a palace officer, 144
 Gaul, represented at Nicæa, 80; orthodox, 112; condition of Catholics, 236; represented at Ariminum, 268; letters to, from Aquileia, 444; relation to Rome, ii. 121-123, 145, 419; condition of the church in, ii. 124-126, 246, 247, 396-399; Pelagian question in, ii. 230-234, 399-403.
See also Councils
 Gaza, 12, 125, 141, 177, 181, 308; ii. 38
 Gelasius, bishop of Cæsarea, 425
 — of Cyzicus, historian, 81
 —, pope, 535; ii. 475
 Genarch (ethnarch), ii. 193
 Genethlius, bishop of Carthage, 539
 Gennadius of Marseilles, ii. 165, 399
 George of Cappadocia, Arian bishop of Alexandria, 241, 266, 270, 274, 310, 345
 —, Arian at Constantinople, ii. 140
 —, bishop of Laodicea, priest at Alex-

andria and Arethusa, 65, 139, 140, 141, 181, 185, 199, 258, 270, 292, 293
 Georgia, 130
 German, St., of Auxerre, ii. 234, 246, 411, 417, 420
 Germanicia, 181, 195, 405, ii. 377, 380
 Germanus, priest of Constantinople, ii. 68, 96
 —, deacon of Constantinople, ii. 452
 Germany, 217, ii. 13; German invasions of Spain, ii. 145
 Germinius, bearer of a letter to Eusebius of Vercellæ, 228
 —, bishop of Sirmium, 253, 268
 Gerontius, bishop of Nicomedia, ii. 45
 —, prefect of Egypt, 321
 —, monk at Constantinople, ii. 513
 Gervasius, Milanese martyr, 496
Gesta de nomine Acacii, ii. 489
 Getæ, ii. 145
 Gibbon on Diocletian, 1; on Constantine's gift to Cæcilian, 8; on the Constantian house, 41; on the election of St. Athanasius, 117; on Byzantine history, 130; on the appeal of St. Athanasius, 152; on Cæcilian's case, 207; on Homoiousion, 248; on St. Hilary, 254, 282; on Mark of Arethusa, 308; on Julian, 309, 321; on Jovian, 341; on honesty of St. Jerome, 365; on Gratian, 403; on elevation of Theodosius, 407; on St. Gregory Nazianzen, 432; on Aurelius Symmachus, 471; on Theodosius and the Gothic war, 503; on Theophilus, 528; panegyric on Theodosius, 543; on Arcadius and Honorius, ii. 2; on Hippo, 4; on St. Chrysostom, 77, 78, 92; on Pulcheria, 236; on Nestorius, 256; on Gaiseric, 404; on letter of Theodore, 408; on Chrysaphius, 502
 Gibraltar, straits of, ii. 304
 Gilboa, Mount, ii. 59
 Gildo the Moor, ii. 21
 "Give what Thou commandest," ii. 163
Gloria in Excelsis, ii. 394
Gloria Patri, 38, 197, 198, 392, ii. 273
 Glorius, a Donatist, ii. 21
 Gnosticism, 73, 89, 251, 524
 Golden Horn at Constantinople, 159
 Golgotha, 121
 Good Friday, 168, 205; ii. 17, 40, 132
 — Shepherd, 129
 Gore, bishop, 93; ii. 413
 Gortyna, ii. 313
 Gospel, book of the, 404, ii. 9, 194; at Ephesus, ii. 318; at Chalcedon, ii. 516, 538
 Gothofred, 376
 Goths, in relation to the Empire: first immigration in 348...280; first war of Valens against, in 367...360; second immigration in 376...387; second war of Valens and battle of Hadrianople in 378...379; third immigration in 386...503; taken into the imperial service, 483,

- 503, ii. 3, 41-43, 119, 305; overrun Balkan peninsula, ii. 3; Greece, ii. 118; Italy, ii. 119-121, 139; siege and capture of Rome, ii. 135-138
- Goths, in relation to the Church: bishop Theophilus, 79, 280; persecution of Christian Goths, 280, 503; bishop Ulphilas and the Gothic Bible, 280; Ulphilas and his converts Arians, 280, 387; Catholic Goths, 387, ii. 38, 40, 93, 299; Arian Goths at Milan, i. 483; at Constantinople, ii. 38, 42, 43; bishop Maximin, 305
- in Spain (Visigoths), 71, 334, 388; ii. 179
- Grace, irresistible, ii. 19, 217, 218, 228; early teaching of Pelagius, ii. 163; Pelagian senses of, ii. 181, 201, 202; prevalent, 230, 232
- Gratian, 384, 395, 402, 403; ecclesiastical legislation, 396, 397; relation to paganism, 397; edict of toleration, 403; edict cancelled, 415; edict against Priscillianists, 423; 441; death, 460, 461; request for his body, 501
- Gratus, bishop of Carthage, 208, 209; ii. 252
- Grecianus, a bishop at Ariminum, 268, 269
- Greece, 78; and *see* Achaia
- Greek, translation into, Constantine's letter, 20; Orosius at Council of Diospolis, ii. 184; Celestine's letter, ii. 327; Leo's letters, ii. 476, 495; translation from, *see* Latin and Syriac
- Gregory of Cappadocia, Arian bishop at Alexandria, 167, 168, 176, 181, 184, 189, 195, 233; ii. 193
- the Illuminator, bishop of Armenia, 79, 112, 131
- , bishop of Elvira, 285, 510
- , bishop of Nazianzen, father of St. Gregory Nazianzen, 79, 284, 370
- , St., Nazianzen, condemned postponement of baptism, 39; on councils, 42, 449-451, 470, ii. 527; on number of Nicene bishops, i. 77; his father, 79; on St. Athanasius, 117, 142, 199, 376; on results of Arianism, 284; on Julian, 295-297, 311, 340; at Athens, 311; on the Labarum, 312; on the portent at Jerusalem, 317; on Julian's reaction, 339; on death of ecclesiastics under Valens, 368; on St. Basil, 368, 389; on death of Eusebius, 370; on Modestus and St. Basil, 372; on Valens at Cæsarea, 373; on Eusebius of Samosata, 378; on Arian persecution, 379; bishop of Sasima, 391, ii. 538; on Arians of Constantinople, i. 408; at Constantinople, 222, 409, 410; his preaching there, 411, 412; theological discourses, 416-418; enthronement, 419, ii. 31; administration, i. 421; at council of year 381...425; resignation, 430, ii. 28; work, i. 431-433; on Nicene Creed, 436, 437; against Apollinarianism, 447-449, ii. 260, 322; taught St. Jerome, i. 454; death, 520; uses "Theotocos," ii. 263; on the Atonement, ii. 269; uses "two natures," ii. 461; cited as an authority, ii. 210, 258, 322, 447, 520, 521
- Gregory the Great, pope, ii. 8, 157, 413, 475, 523
- , bishop of Neocæsarea, 37, 38, 388; ii. 8, 447
- , bishop of Nyssa; on Gregory of Neocæsarea, 38; on Eunomius, 251; on Demosthenes, 373; 378; on St. Basil, 393; on Arian talk, 409; 425; funeral sermon on Meletius, 426; 440, 481, 542; ii. 4, 260, 263, 323, 447
- , bishop of Tours, 27, 401; ii. 508
- , chief of police, 240
- , prætorian prefect of Italy, 209
- , presbyter and biographer of Gregory Nazianzen, 409
- the Seventh, pope, ii. 105, 413
- , uncle of St. Basil, 388
- Guizot, ii. 159
- Gwatkin, Professor, his phrase a "demi-god," 72; on Nicene issue, 92; on Dedication Creed, 175; on date of attempted capture of St. Athanasius, 240; on St. Athanasius and Constantius, 245; on Anomœans, 252; on Eudoxius, 257; on Jovian, 340
- Gymnasius, a bishop opposed to Chrysostom, ii. 71

H

- Habeo, sed non do*, 12
- Habesh (Abyssinia), 215
- Hadrian, emperor, 26
- I., pope, 475
- , prætorian prefect of Italy, ii. 114
- Hadrianople, 84, 141, 181, 191, 197, 270, 379, 394, 402, 416
- Hadriatic, 267; ii. 3
- Hadrumentum, ii. 227
- Hæmus, 191
- Haman, ii. 193
- Hampton Court conference, ii. 455
- Haram (St. Jerome), ii. 200
- Hardwick, archdeacon, ii. 219
- Harpocration, deacon of Dioscorus, ii. 489
- Haruspices, 47
- Hawarden, Dr., 72
- Hearers, an order of penitents, 35, 39, 109
- Heart of Midlothian*, ii. 515
- Hebdomon, a suburb of Constantinople, ii. 63, 237, 451
- Hebrews, the Gospel according to, ii. 207
- Hefele on Easter, 101; on suburbicarian churches, 105; on Sardican letter to Julius, 189; on state of affairs in year 353...226; on date of ordination of Aetius, 251; on Liberius, 256, 262; on

- Constantinopolitan canons, 438; on order of events at Ephesus, ii. 340; on the fifth session at Chalcedon, ii. 528, 532
- Hekebolius, 296, 303, 311
- Helena, St., 120-124, 140; ii. 533
- , wife of Julian, 302
- Helene, a town in southern Gaul, 219
- Heleniana (church of the Holy Cross at Rome), 127
- Heliopolis, 125, 308, 377
- Helios, 300, 306, 319
- Helladius, deacon and adherent of Arius, 61
- , bishop of Cappadocian Cæsarea, 425, 440; ii. 45
- , bishop of Ptolemais, ii. 344
- , bishop of Tarsus, ii. 241, 358, 365, 378, 388
- , pagan priest and grammarian, 531
- Helvidius, 477, 523, 526
- Henosis*, ii. 265
- Henry VIII., 38
- Heraclas, bishop of Alexandria, 118
- Heraclea in Egypt, 78, 149
- in Pontus, 263
- in Thrace, 79, 107, 179, 219, 353, 439; ii. 44, 240, 541
- Heracian, count, ii. 156, 174
- Heracidas, Egyptian bishop, 510
- Heracles, bishop of Ephesus, ii. 45, 70, 72, 102
- , an imperial steward, 8
- Heracius, bishop of Hippo, ii. 9
- Hercules, 281, 537; ii. 24, 93
- Herenas, a Priscillianist bishop, ii. 26
- Heretical baptism. *See* Baptism
- Heretics, action of the State against:
- Laws (not always meant to be put in execution, 113, 459, ii. 254, 255); **Constantine**, 325 (Arians)...113; **Gratian**, 396, 397; **378** (Eunomians, Photinians, Manicheans)...403; Aug. 3, **379**...415; **381** (Priscillianists)...423; **Theodosius**, Feb. 28, **380**...415; Jan. 10, **381** (Photinians, Arians, Eunomians)...422; **382** (Manicheans)...513; July 25, **383** (Eunomians, Arians, Macedonians, Manicheans, Encratites)...459, 524; Sept. 3, **383** (Apollinarians)...459; early in **388** (Apollinarians)...524; June 14, **388**...524; June 16, **388**...525; Aug. 8, **388** (Arians)...525; **389** (Eunomians)...525; **389** (Manicheans)...513, 525; ii. 114; **Arcadius**, 395...ii. 3, 191; March, **398** (Eunomians)...ii. 38; **Honorius**, Feb. 12, **405** (Manicheans, Donatists)...ii. 114, 115; **408** (Donatists)...ii. 135; Aug. 25, **410** (Donatists)...ii. 146; Jan. 30, **412** (Donatists)...ii. 154; **Theodosius II.** (Eunomians), ii. 254; May 30, **428** (*a.* Eunomians, Montanists, Marcionites, Messalians, Donatists, Paulianists, Manicheans; *b.* Arians, Macedonians, Apollinarians; *c.* Novatians)...ii. 255; Aug. 3, **435** (Nestorians)...ii. 387; **449** (supposed Nestorians)...ii. 492, 494
- Penalties employed: confiscation of books (**325**, etc.)...113, ii. 387, 494; of churches (Gratian, etc.)...396, 397, 422, ii. 154, 191; of houses used as churches (**383**)...i. 459; banishment from Rome (Gratian, etc.)...397, 513, ii. 211; exile (**317**, etc.)...32, 214, 334, 423, 459, 523, ii. 115, 154; fines (Theodosius, etc.)...ii. 114, 115, 154, 256; emancipation of slaves (**405**)...ii. 114; beatings (**412**)...ii. 154; disqualification for government service (**395**, etc.)...ii. 4, 254; disqualification for bequeathing property (**382**, etc.)...i. 513, 525; disqualification for inheriting property (Theodosius, etc.)...ii. 114, 254; disqualification for giving evidence, acquiring gifts, making contracts (**405**)...ii. 115
- Acts specially forbidden: religious discussions (**381**, etc.)...422, 525; assemblies for worship (**378**, etc.)...403, 459, ii. 3, 255, 387; inside cities (**381**, etc.)...422, ii. 255; in suburbs (**389**)...i. 525; ordinations (**383**, etc.)...459, 524, ii. 3, 256
- Hermogenes, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 95
- , a general, 179, 180, 222
- (Hymenæus), ii. 151
- Herod the Great, ii. 193
- Herodias, ii. 77
- Heros, bishop of Arles, ii. 185, 200, 206, 208
- Hesychius, a deacon and envoy to Rome, 166
- , count, 181
- Hierapolis, ii. 242; and *see* Alexander of
- Hierax, a schoolmaster at Alexandria, ii. 193
- Hilaris, a Sicilian and correspondent of Augustine, ii. 174, 180, 187
- Hilarus, deacon and papal representative at the Latrocinium, ii. 472, 480, 482, 486, 489, 495
- Hilary, St., bishop of Arles, 27; ii. 232, 247, 419-421
- , a deacon of Rome and Luciferian, 226, 232, 331
- , a layman in Gaul and correspondent of Augustine, ii. 231, 234, 401
- , a notary, 240
- , St., bishop of Poitiers, on number of Nicene bishops, 77; on Homocousion, 92; on Arian creeds, 93; on the Council of Antioch, 173; on Sardicæ Encyclical, 188; on Photinus, 194; on St. Athanasius and Marcellus, 218; bishop of Poitiers, 221; the Fragments, 224, 255, 274, 285; on people of Milan, 228; on Council of Milan, 232; denounced Auxentius, 233; wrote to Constantius, 237; "On the Trinity," 238; his literary style, 238; on profanation of the Eucharist, 238, ii.

- 125; on semi-Arians, 248; on Creed of Sirmium, 253; on Hosius, 254; on Liberius, 257; on the bishops of the Blasphemia, 261; "On the councils," 265; on Constantius and semi-Arianism, 267, 270; at Seleucia, 270; on Arian creeds, 281; against Constantius, 282; attacked by the Luciferians, 331; on Demophilus, 367; at Milan in year 364...349-351; death, 352; visited by St. Martin, 399; on Eastern Arianism, 408; cited as an authority, ii. 176, 520, 521
- Hill-folk (Montensians or Donatists), 208, 395
- Himerius, bishop of Nicomedia, ii. 344, 359, 365, 376
- , bishop of Tarragona, 479
- Hindustan, 243
- Hippo Regius, description and history, ii. 4, 5; council in 393...539, ii. 20, 109; Donatists at, ii. 5, 135, 154; Augustine at, ii. 5, and *see* under Augustine; Pelagius at, ii. 166; Orosius at, ii. 179; siege of, ii. 304-306
- Hippodrome at Constantinople, 128, 222, 410; ii. 40, 518
- Hippolytus, 49, 101
- Hodgkin, Dr., 2, 47; ii. 2, 119, 137, 246, 407, 508
- Holland, Canon H. S., 89, 112
- Holy Spirit, doctrine of, in the traditional doxologies, 38, 197, 198; in the Nicene Creed, 96, 345; extreme subordinationism, "the Son inferior to the Father, and the Spirit to the Son," 209; Eunomianism, "the Son a creature of the Father, and the Spirit a creature of the Son," 289, 458; Macedonianism, "the Son co-equal with the Father, the Spirit a creature of the Son," foreshadowed at Sirmium in 351...220; developed *c.* 358...245, 289, 290, 380, 417, 433, 457; strong in Asia, Phrygia, and the Hellespont, 382, 425; Arius and, 143; Catholic doctrine asserted by Athanasius, *c.* 358...244, 245, 289; in 362...328; in 363...344, 345; by Paulinus of Antioch, 363...347; at Rome, 371...382, in 378...404, in 380...406; in Illyria, 375...382; Amphilochius of Iconium, 392, ii. 258; Meletius of Antioch, 379...405; Gregory, 380...411, 416, 417; Theodosius, 380...415, 381...422; Council of Constantinople in 381...433-435, in 382...452, 453; position of St. Basil, 192, 374, 381, 389, 392, 436
- Books on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit: Donatus of Carthage, 208; Athanasius (Letters to Serapion), 244, 245, 289; Basil, 391, 392; Didymus of Alexandria, 478; Ambrose, 416, 441, ii. 16; Augustine (On the Spirit and the Letter), ii. 171
- The procession of the Holy Spirit, 417, 435: "of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin," 347, 435, ii. 264, 518, 530; the Holy Spirit in the prophets, i. 435; in Christ, 327; in us, ii. 171, 199, 220; in the sacrament of baptism, 514, 515; confirmation, ii. 198; ordination, ii. 198; in councils, ii. 481
- Homo*, used for manhood, ii. 395, 396
- Homœan Arianism, 249, 274; *see* also Acacius of Cæsarea
- Homoiousion*, 248, 278; *see* also Semi-Arians
- Homoousion*, history of the term, 91
- Honoratus, a bishop and correspondent of Augustine, ii. 172, 305
- , bishop of Arles, ii. 231, 232, 247
- , bishop of Vercellæ, ii. 15, 17
- Honorius, emperor, son of Theodosius, 27, 127, 534; ii. 1; steps against idolatry, 23; 85, 92, 97; against Donatism, 114; 118; on imperial favours, 133; 134, 135; and Alaric, 136, 137; revocation of liberty of worship, 146; law against Donatists, 154; vigorous action, 156; and the Jews, 191, 192; letter on Pelagianism, 211; 215; death, 246; 542
- Hooker, 32, 142, 270; ii. 258, 280
- Hort, Dr., 90, 437
- Hortensius* of Cicero, 493
- Hosea, ii. 241
- Hosius, bishop of Cordova, furnished list to Cæcilian for distribution of Constantine's gift, 8; influence on Constantine, 32, 80; bearer of Constantine's letter to Alexander and Arius, 70; at Nicæa, 80, 94; at Sardica, 180, 181; on Valens and Ursacius, 201; probably not at Sirmium in 351...219; and Constantius, 235; signed Sirmian Creed, 254; different views on, 254, 255
- Hospitalier, ii. 53
- Hours of prayer, ii. 177
- Huguenots, ii. 20
- Humanitarianism, 157
- Hungary, 398
- Hunneric the Vandal, 232, 388
- Huns, 387; ii. 43, 508
- Hussey, Dr., 60
- Huzitis, 203
- Hydrax, ii. 143
- Hydroparastatæ, 524
- Hyginus, a bishop, 502
- Hymns, of St. Ambrose, 492, 495, ii. 288, 356; at Constantinople, ii. 46, 47; at Marcianopolis, ii. 359; of St. Patrick, ii. 417
- Hypatia, ii. 141, 194, 195, 425, 480
- Hypatian, bishop of Heraclea, 353
- Hypatius, bishop of Gangra, 79
- , consul in 359...266
- Hypostasis*, non-theological senses, 325; in Neo-Platonism, 93; in Christian theology, (1) = being or essence or substance (one

hypostasis in the Trinity), Ep. Hebrews, 89; most ante-Nicenes, 97; Council of Antioch in 269...325; Nicene anathemas, 96, 175, 325; Athanasius, 325; Basil of Ancyra, 248; Council of Rome, 371 or 372...382: (2) = subsistence or person (three hypostases in the Trinity), some Alexandrian ante-Nicenes, 325; Alexander of Alexandria and Arius, 68; Dedication Creed, 175, 325; Athanasius occasionally, 325; anti-Sabellian churchmen, 325; Basil of Cæsarea, 389; Cyril of Alexandria, ii. 279: both uses at the Council of Alexandria in 362...326, 389, ii. 279, 409: *physis* and *hypostasis* in St. Cyril, ii. 381-384

Hypsele, town in Egypt, 200

Hyrcanis, ii. 447

I

Iamblichus, Neo-Platonist, 297, 300

Ibas, bishop of Edessa, ii. 434-436, 439-445, 471, 490, 498, 519, 536, 537; letter to Maris, ii. 328, 434, 435, 445, 536, 537, 550

Iberia, 130, 131

Iconium, 392

Idacius, bishop of Merida, 423

Idolatry. *See* Paganism

Ignatian epistles, 40; ii. 25

Ignatius Loyola, 522

Ignorance of our Lord as Man, 417; ii. 230

Illustres, ii. 154

Illyria, 191, 382, 399

Illyricum, 3, 219; bishops from, at Sardica, 184, 188; at Ariminum, 268; 379; Eastern Illyricum, i. 407, ii. 96, 134, 197, 222

Inadequacy of theological terms, 68, 411; ii. 296

Incense, 122, 200; ii. 324

Ingenuit orbis, 277

Ingentius, an ædile's clerk, 24

Ingilram, Italian bishop, ii. 546

Inispatrick, ii. 417

Innocent I., pope, 402-417...ii. 82, 118, 204; case of St. Chrysostom, ii. 82-85, 96-99, 121, 197; decretal letters on questions of discipline, ii. 117, 121-123; paganism in Rome, ii. 136; the privileges of the Church of Antioch, 107, ii. 196-198, 331; Pelagianism, ii. 177, 184, 201-204, 210; consecrated Julian of Eclanum, ii. 220; on papal prerogatives, ii. 85, 121, 203, 204

— III., pope, ii. 413

— XI., pope, ii. 116

—, priest at Hippo, ii. 155

Innocentius (Vincentius), 81

Instantius, Priscillianist bishop, 423, 463-465, 468

Intercessions for criminals, ii. 11

Invocation of saints, 476; ii. 40

Iona, ii. 144

Irenæus, St., bishop of Lyons, 27, 91, 157

—, count, afterwards bishop of Tyre, ii. 312, 328, 329, 335, 387, 388, 429, 430, 438, 439, 445, 467, 490-492

Iris river, 368

Irish mission of Palladius, ii. 234, 235; of St. Patrick, ii. 414-418

Isaac, bishop, accuser of Chrysostom, ii. 66, 70, 71

—, a Donatist martyr, 211

—, a Jewish convert and apostate, 395

—, a monk, accuser of Chrysostom, ii. 49, 68, 75

—, another monk, under Valens, 379

— the patriarch, 476

Isaiah, the prophet, 499; ii. 126

Isaurians, 266; ii. 90, 91, 100

Ischyas, 59, 145, 149-152, 167, 181

Isdegerdes (Yazdegerd) I., king of Persia, ii. 145, 245

— II., ii. 245

Isidore, bishop of Cyrrhos, 405

—, a supporter of Meletius, 54

— of Pelusium, ii. 244, 245, 341, 379, 423, 424

—, a monk and companion of Athanasius, 169

—, priest of Alexandria, ii. 29, 39, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 58

—, supposed translator of Greek canons, 104

Ision, a Meletian bishop, 145

—, an orphan boy, 146

Isis, ii. 136

Israel (clubs), 211

Italy, technical meaning of, 30

Ithacius, a Spanish bishop, 423, 463, 515, 516

"It is not right to hide the Lord's work," 216

"I will cook a dish for him," ii. 49

J

Jacob, the patriarch, 476

James, St., the Just, 103; ii. 244

—, a count at Ephesus, ii. 336

— the First, king, ii. 210

—, bishop of Nisibis, 79

—, a Nestorian priest of Constantinople, ii. 330

—, a Pelagian and correspondent of Augustine, ii. 175

Jamnia, 62

Janiculum hill at Rome, 208

Jansen, Jansenists, ii. 228, 401

Januarius, Donatist bishop, 335

—, another Donatist bishop, ii. 117

—, correspondent of Augustine, ii. 24

Jephthah, a Nestorian bishop, ii. 359

Jeremiah, the prophet, ii. 67

Jeremy Taylor, 69

Jerome, St., character, 455; early life, 454; priest, 454, 455, ii. 4; life in Rome, i. 455, 476-480; opinion of Roman clergy, 365, 479, 480; of Roman deacons, 40; of Roman monks, 480; his lady friends at Rome, i. 455, 477, 479; Marcella, 169, 455, 477-479, 481; Lea, 477; Asella, 477; Paula, 477-481; Blæsilla, 478, 480; Eustochium, 478, 479, 481; Fabiola, ii. 123; Demetrias, ii. 177; his life at Bethlehem, 481, 482, 541, 542, ii. 139, 144, 200; controversy with Jovinian, 538; with John of Jerusalem and Rufinus over Origenism, 541, 542, ii. 49-52, 54, 55, 58, 59; with Vigilantius, ii. 125-129; with Augustine, ii. 129, 130; against the Pelagians, ii. 180-182, 189, 200, 403; cited as an authority, ii. 176, 403

St. Jerome as a Biblical scholar: revision of the Psalter, 477; revision of the Latin Gospels, 476, 477; Hebrew learning, 477, 478, 481, ii. 130, 200; translation of the O.T. from Hebrew, 291, 541, ii. 129, 130; on the LXX., 477, 541, ii. 130; on the Apocrypha, ii. 130; the Gospel according to the Hebrews, ii. 207

St. Jerome as a writer: his letters, 476, 478, 538, ii. 52, 54, 129, 177; his Chronicle, i. 42, 43, 60, 257, 313, 329; on Paul the hermit, 131; *De Viris Illustribus*, 257, ii. 165; Against the Luciferians, i. 330; translation of Origen on the Song of Solomon, 477; Against Helvidius, 477; On Hebrew Places, 481; Against Jovinian, and Defence, 538; translation of Origen on Principles, ii. 52; Against Rufinus, in three books, ii. 54, 55; Against Vigilantius, ii. 126; Dialogues, in three books, against the Pelagians, ii. 181, 182

St. Jerome and Clement of Rome, ii. 205; Origen, 477, 541, ii. 49-52, 126; the Alexandrian episcopate, i. 118; bishop and priest, 119; necessity of the priesthood, 331; sixth Nicene canon, 107; Rheticius of Autun, 21, 478; Hilary, 239; Liberius, 255, 257; Cyril of Jerusalem, 258, 482; the Council of Ariminum, 277, 284, 285, 332; Julian's education act, 313; the Antiochene schism, 329, 454, 482; Lucifer, 329-331; the election of Damasus, 362; Pacian, 397; Phœbadius, 397; Gregory Nazianzen, 454; Gregory of Nyssa, 454; Didymus, 478, 481; John of Jerusalem, 482, 542, ii. 182; Ambrose, ii. 16; Epiphanius, ii. 49; Theophilus, ii. 51, 59; Exuperius, ii. 125; Augustine, ii. 129, 180, 182; synod of Diospolis, ii. 189; Theodore of Mopsuestia and, ii. 200

Jerusalem (*Ælia*), creed of, 88, 434-436;

relation to Cæsarea, 103, 199, 258, ii. 186, 244, 332, 534; to Bethlehem, 481, ii. 51; to the Saracens, ii. 312; to Phœnicia and Arabia, ii. 349; precedence at Council of Ephesus, ii. 319; patriarchate over Palestine, ii. 534, 535; the Holy Places and the buildings of Helena and Constantine, i. 120-124; the dedication festival of the great church, 149, 153, ii. 58, 185; councils at, 140, 153, 199; Origenist question at, 541, 542, ii. 49, 58, 59; Pelagian question at, ii. 182-185, 211; Cyril of Alexandria at, ii. 393

Jerusalem, bishops of (*see* further under each name): Macarius, before 319...62; Maximus, before 335...149; Cyril, 350...258; John, 386...482; Praylius, 417...ii. 207; Juvenal, before 428...ii. 244

Jesuits, ii. 228

Jews, organization, ii. 192; relation of Julian to, 315-317; of Christian emperors to, 305, ii. 191-193; Jews at Ancyra, i. 34; at Rome, 477, 508; in Osrhoene, 508; at Constantinople, ii. 34, 81; at Antioch, ii. 192, 196; at Alexandria, ii. 193, 194; at Edessa, ii. 355; in Syria, ii. 389; Jewish influence over Christians, 100, 101, ii. 34, 192; Jewish converts, 124, 395, 521, ii. 240; Basil and, 369; Jerome and, 477, 481, ii. 126; Ambrose and, 508, ii. 192; Chrysostom and, ii. 34, 192; Cyril and, ii. 191, 193, 194, 425, 480

Jezebel, ii. 71

Joannites, adherents of Chrysostom, ii. 81, 88, 92, 96, 99, 106, 196, 238, 409, 410

Job, 267, 486; ii. 72, 74, 126, 183, 241

Joel, the prophet, 156

John Baptist, St., Church of, at Rome, 126; at Constantinople, ii. 63

John, Arcaph, bishop of Memphis, 114, 115, 144, 147, 148, 150, 161

—, bishop of Antioch, ii. 287, 289, 291; letter to Nestorius, 292; alienated by Cyril, 308, 309; delay in reaching Ephesus, 315, 319; arrival, 325, 326; refusal to attend, 329; claim over Cyprus, 331; led party of abstention, 337-339, 344; at close of Ephesus, 353; 356-358: St. Cyril on his conduct, 360; imperial letter to, 360, 361; presentation of his letter to Cyril, 370; his part in the Reunion, 372-376; 386; letter to Proclus, 388, 389; death, 422; 435, 437, 450; recognised St. Cyril, 517

—, bishop of Apamea, 405

—, bishop of Damascus, ii. 344

—, bishop of Germanicia, ii. 377

—, bishop of Hephæstus, ii. 488

—, bishop of Hyrcanis, ii. 447

—, bishop of Jerusalem, 482, 541, 542; ii. 4, 49-51, 54, 94, 182-186

—, a Nestorian bishop, ii. 359

- John, a bishop of Persia, 79, 202
 —, bishop of Theodosiopolis, ii. 440
 —, Cassian. *See* Cassian
 —, Chrysostom, St. *See* Chrysostom
 —, commissioner at Ephesus, ii. 335-338
 —, deacon, accuser of Chrysostom, ii. 66, 69, 70
 —, martyr at Rome under Julian, 311
 —, monk at Constantinople, ii. 69, 70
 —, priest and advocate, ii. 448, 451, 455, 468
 —, priest, ii. 509
 —, secretary to St. Cyril, ii. 335
 —, notary to Dioscorus, ii. 480, 482
 —, Western usurper, ii. 246
 Johnson, Dr., ii. 259
 Jonah, the prophet, 430, 487; ii. 130
 Jonathan, 461
 Joppa, ii. 322
 Joseph, 216
 —, a converted Jew, 124
 Joshua, ii. 67
 Jovian, a bishop, ii. 456
 —, emperor, 312, 333, 339-342, 348
 Jovinian, 513-515, 538; ii. 14, 125, 180, 181, 185, 207
 Jovius, minister of Honorius, ii. 136
 Judith, ii. 130
 Julian, grandfather of the emperor, 295
 —, bishop of Cos, ii. 450, 456, 477, 480, 506, 510
 —, bishop of Eclanum, ii. 220; his letter to Zosimus, 221, 330; as a controversialist, 223-225; 241, 276, 277, 285, 286, 412, 419
 —, count, 320
 —, emperor, comparable with Licinius, 4, 43; his death-cry and Maximin's, 6; 179; on Aquileia, 195; Donatist edict, 214; court at Paris, 285; early history, 295; Caesar, 302; letter to people of Bostra, 304; method, 305; treatise, 315; the "beardhater," 318; hated St. Athanasius, 321; death, 322; internal Church affairs under, 323-336; the Christians and his death, 337, 338; his kinsman Procopius, 355; St. Basil and, 369; 423, 529, ii. 263, 410
 —, monk, 375
 Juliana, mother of Demetrias, ii. 177, 178
 —, wife of Memor, ii. 220
 Julius, adherent of Arius, 61
 —, Constantius, 295
 —, I., pope, on the number of Nicene bishops, 77; on condemnation of Arius, 98; on Mareotic trial of St. Athanasius, 152; his date and character, 166; reception of St. Athanasius, 169; relations with Eusebius, 171, 172, 176; represented at Sardica, 181; received letter from Sardica, 189; letter to Alexandrians in year 346... 196; form of Gloria Patri, 198; received recantation of Valens and Ursacius, 201; ii. 85, 409, 463
 Julius, bishop of Puteoli, ii. 472, 480, 482, 485, 486, 488, 489
 Junius Bassus, 361
 Jupiter, 312, 537; ii. 173
Jura, perjura, 464
Jus Cyprium, ii. 332
 Justina, wife of Valentinian I., 395, 400; and Ambrose, 462, 482-492, 497, 502
 Justinian, emperor, 364; ii. 388, 537, 550
 Justin Martyr, St., 123
 Justus, bishop of Lyons, 398
 Juvenal, 21, 134
 —, bishop of Jerusalem, ii. 244, 289, 292, 312, 319, 320, 322, 332, 343, 349, 479, 480, 482, 487, 491, 492, 505, 516, 518, 520, 534, 536, 546
 Juveninus, martyr under Julian, 313
- K
- Kathisma* at Constantinople, 128
 Keble, 87, 129, ii. 127
 Kenoticism, ii. 475, 550
 Kilpatrick on Clyde, ii. 415
 Kingsley, "Hermits," ii. 245
 Kingsmen, ii. 550
 Kiss of peace, ii. 184
 Kitchin, Dean, ii. 247
 Kneelers, an order of penitents, 35, 39, 109
 Knights Templar, 467
 Knox, John, ii. 38
- L
- Labarum*, 3, 45, 312, 340, 537
 Lacedæmon, 296
 Lactantius, 6, 12, 476
 Læta, wife of Toxotius, 481
 —, widow of Gratian, ii. 136
Lætitia, ii. 6
 Laity, 36, 82; ii. 45, 46, 455
 Lampon, a priest of Alexandria, ii. 275
 Lampascus, 353 (*see* Council of); ii. 99
 Lanciani, Professor, 126, 535
 Laodicea in Pisidia, ii. 78
 —, in Syria, bishop George, 65, 139, 140, 199; bishop Theodotus, 65, 140; bishop Anatolius, 101; St. Athanasius at, 198, 199, 440, ii. 78
 Laoghaire (Leary), king, ii. 417
 Lapsed, 13, 35, 108; ii. 204
 Lar, 532
 Lateran, 21, 126, 208, 234; council in year 1215... 441, ii. 7, 123, 137
 Latin Church, technical terms of, ii. 396
 Latin, translations into from Greek: Gospels, (Jerome) 477; Psalter, (Jerome) 477; Origen, *On Song of Solomon*, (Jerome) 477, *On Principles*, (Rufinus) ii. 51, (Jerome) ii. 52; Pamphilus, *Defence of Origen* (Rufinus), ii. 51; Eusebius,

- History* (Rufinus), ii. 305; Nicene canons, 104, 105, ii. 249, 250, 546; Nicene Creed, ii. 250; Nestorius's sermons and letters, ii. 264, 285, 286 (at Rome), 287 (at Alexandria), 288, 289; his anathemas (Marius Mercator), ii. 303; Theodoret *Pentalogus* (selections, Marius Mercator), ii. 359; Irenæus, *Tragedy*, ii. 388; Eutyches's letter to Leo, ii. 463; Formulary of Flavian (Liberatus), ii. 470; Acts of the Latrocinium, ii. 487, 488
- Latrocinium, term applied to council of Milan in year 355...232; to the Council of Ephesus (*see* Ephesus) in the year 449...ii. 493, 512
- Laud, archbishop, ii. 37
- Laughter, the fathers on, ii. 32
- Laura*, 134
- Laurence, St., 127, 311, 362, 475
- Lauricius, a governor, 271
- Law used for Christian religion, ii. 146
- Lazarus, the beggar, 538
- , bishop of Aix, ii. 185, 200, 206, 208
- Lea, a Roman lady, 477
- Learning, classical and philosophical, in the Church, 89, 314; the two Apollinares, 199, 314, ii. 238; George of Alexandria's library, i. 241; Ætius and Aristotelian logic, 251; view of Socrates, 314; Stephen of Germanicia, 405; Augustine (Virgil), 492, 500, (Cicero) 493; Ambrose (Virgil, Aristotle, Cicero, Philo), ii. 16; Platonism in Origen, ii. 50, in the Nitrian monks, ii. 59, in Synesius, ii. 142; Theodoret (*Æschylus* and *Sophocles*), ii. 407, (Plato, Aristotle, and medical writers), ii. 490
- , Hebrew: Jerome, 477, 478, 481, ii. 130, 200; Blasilla, i. 480
- Lebanon, Mount, 125, 529
- Lectors (readers), 13, 296
- Ledan, 203
- Leinster, ii. 417
- Lent, ii. 12, 79, 195, 235
- Leo, St., the Great, Pope, on Easter, 102; on Priscillianism, 468; acolyte, ii. 216, 222; presbyter, 250; archdeacon, 288, 412; date of elevation, 413; sermons, 414; on reception of Pelagians, 418, 419; on claims of Arles and Vienne, 419–421; and St. Cyril, 421, 422; letter to Eutyches, 445; his agent at Constantinople, 450; 460; correspondence with Flavian, 462–465; the Tome, 465, 472–475, 520, 522, 525, 526, 532; other letters on Eutychian controversy, 476–478; letters to Pulcheria, 493, 497, 506; author of the name Latrocinium, 506; letters to Flavian and Theodosius, 495, 496; failure with Theodosius, 502; heard of Flavian's death, 503; and Marcian, 504; further correspondence, 507; his legates at Chalcedon, 516; recognised Maximus as bishop of Antioch, 524, 534; addressed by letter from council of Chalcedon, 548
- Leonas, an officer, 271–274
- Leontius, bishop of Ancyra, ii. 38, 40, 78, 89
- , bishop of Antioch, 139, 192, 193; use of Gloria Patri, 198; 245, 251, 257
- of Byzantium, ii. 382
- , bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, 79
- , a friend of St. Ambrose, 385
- , St., of Hippo, ii. 7
- of Magnesia, ii. 488
- , a Novatian, 510
- , a priest, 260
- , another priest, ii. 390
- , a sophist, ii. 237
- Leporius, monk, ii. 229, 230, 395
- Leprosus, 401
- Le Quien, 107; ii. 331, 538, 541
- Lerins, ii. 247
- Letters of Communion, 173
- Leucadius, Count, 469
- Levitical marriage code, 38
- Libanius, a rhetorician, 296, 301, 303, 309, 318–320; 337, 368; description of Antioch, 504; on prayer, 507; a pagan Spelman, 529
- , a visitor to St. Chrysostom, ii. 94
- Libellus*, 491, ii. 166, 205, 448, 463
- Liberatus, archdeacon, ii. 308, 313, 360, 469, 470, 489, 521, 549
- Liberius, bishop of Emerita, 27
- , Pope, 195; date of succession, 224; letter to Hosius, 226; letter to Constantius, 226, 227; letter to Eusebius of Vercellæ, 227; banished, 235; lapse, 255; not represented at Ariminum, 268; effaced his lapse, 285; 332; and semi-Arians, 357, 358; death, 360; ii. 408
- Libya, 67, 78, 104, 105, 165, 189, 191; ii. 124
- Licentius, 499
- Licinius, comrade of Galerius, 4; policy, 4; defeated Maximin, 5; promulgated edict of toleration, 6, 41; and Constantine, chap. iv. p. 41, 68; his death, 45; supported by Eusebius of Nicomedia, 62, 119; his persecution, 79, 128; probably received denunciation of Bishop Alexander, 56
- Liddon, Dr., 30, 31, 93
- "Life died," ii. 436, 442
- Lightfoot, bishop, 16, 36, 102, 149, 158, 495; ii. 130
- Liguria, 385
- Like "in all things," 267, 273
- Limata, 14
- Lincoln, bishop Adelfius, 28; 188
- Lincolnshire dedications to St. Helena, 124
- Lindisfarne, ii. 144
- Lisbon, 253
- Little horse, instrument of torture, 13; ii. 155
- Liturgy of Alexandria, 43; of Armenia, 112; of Syria, 201

Locociagum, 399
 Lodi, 442
Logos, St. John's use of, 89
 London, 28, 188
 Longinus, bishop of Ascalon, 62
 —, bishop of Chersonesus, ii. 450, 458
 Louis, St., 163; ii. 297
 — XIV., 371; ii. 116
 Lous (August), 319
 Low Sunday, ii. 439
 Lucentius, bishop of Asculum, ii. 508, 510, 511
 —, Roman legate, ii. 545, 548
 Lucernarium, ii. 25
 Lucian, martyr of Antioch, 10, 175, 360;
 instructor of Arius, 58; of Eusebius of
 Nicomedia, 62; his theory of the soul, 64
 Lucifer, bishop of Caliaris, 226, 285, 323,
 328
 Luciferians, 330, 510
 Lucilla, a lady at Carthage, 17, 19
 Lucina, 127
 Lucius of Alexandria, 321, 345, 377, 378,
 418
 —, an adherent of Arius, 61
 — of Hadrianople, 181, 184, 191
 —, an officer, ii. 86
 Ludovicus Pius, 76
 Luke, St., 312; ii. 127
Lupercalia, 535
 Lupicinus, Bishop, ii. 68
 Lupus, bishop of Troy, ii. 234
 Lutetia (Paris), 285
 Lycia, 67; ii. 65
 Lycopolis, 53
 Lydda, 140; ii. 58
 Lyons, 27, 181, 219, 398, 460, 461
 Lysimachus, 76

M

Macarius, an acquaintance of Rufinus at
 Rome, ii. 51
 —, Alexandrian monk, 244
 —, Alexandrian priest, 146, 149, 151,
 158, 160
 —, a commissioner, 209, 334; ii. 151
 — of Egypt, 244
 —, an Egyptian bishop, ii. 296
 —, Eusebian priest, 166
 —, bishop of Jerusalem, 62, 78, 121, 123,
 181
 —, bishop of Laodicea, ii. 344
 Macaulay, Lord, ii. 331
 Macedonia, 78, 153, 333, 407, 454
 Macedonianism, 245, 289, 341, 380, 382,
 406, 417, 425, 433, 521; ii. 38, 141, 239,
 255
 Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, 117,
 161, 164, 179, 180, 222, 248, 253, 270, 281
 —, Gratian's master of the offices, 424,
 463
 Macedonius, a hermit in Syria, 507
 —, bishop of Mopsuestia, 151, 195, 219
 —, a Phrygian martyr under Julian, 311
 —, a tribune, ii. 467, 469
 Macellum in Cappadocia, 295
 Macrina, sister of St. Basil, 368
 Macrinus, bishop of Jamnia, 62
 Macrobius, Donatist bishop of Hippo, ii.
 13, 135, 155
 Macrostich, the, 194. *See* under Creeds
 Madaura, 492
 Maffean fragments, the, 54, 55, 310, 321,
 322, 355
 Magian priests in Persia, 203, 204, 205
 Magic, 3, 147, 160, 311
 Magnentius, usurping emperor, 219, 241
 Magnus, a bishop, 467
 —, a count, 377
 —, a silentiary, ii. 455, 469, 484
 Mahomet, 129
 Maiuma, the port of Gaza, 125, 308
 Majorinus, Donatist bishop at Carthage, 19,
 20, 206, 207, 539; ii. 130
 Malabar, ii. 256
Maleficus, 147, 480
 Mamas, St., of Cappadocian Cæsarea, 296
 —, a priest of Constantinople, ii. 451,
 452
 Mamre (Terebinthus), 124
 Man of the Lord, 455
 Manes (Mani), 202, 513; ii. 131, 432, 481
 Manicheans, 403, 493; at Rome, 510;
 system, 510-513; ii. 5, 114, 131, 179,
 207, 224, 255, 276, 282, 499, 501, 517
 Mappala, ii. 112
 Mappalia, the Huts, ii. 405
 Maran, 381
 Maras, deacon of Edessa, ii. 440, 442
 —, priest of Edessa, ii. 436, 440, 442
 Marcella, Roman lady, 169, 455, 477, 481,
 538; ii. 52, 137
 Marcellinus, a Roman Luciferian, 257, 331,
 475, 510
 —, a subdeacon of Carthage, ii. 210
 —, tribune and notary, ii. 146-156, 169,
 171, 173, 180
 Marcellus of Ancyra, 34, 79, 94, 154, 156; his
 teaching, 157, 176, 179; relation to Julius,
 172; condemned at Antioch, 175; 176;
 at Sardica, 181-184; his pupil Photinus,
 193; 228, 387
 —, bishop of Apamea, 529
 —, a Campanian bishop, 225
 Marcian, Donatist bishop, 18
 —, emperor, ii. 504, 506-514, 524, 533,
 534, 538, 548, 549
 —, Novatian bishop of Constantinople,
 357
 — tribune, ii. 95
 Marcianopolis, ii. 358, 359
 Marcianus, bishop of Arles, 27
 Marcionism, 524; ii. 38, 89, 242, 255, 432,
 499

- Marcomanni, German tribes, ii. 13
 Marcus, a Donatist bishop, 211
 Marcus Aurelius, emperor, 314
 —, a bishop of Calabria, 79
 — of Memphis, founder of Priscillianism, 423
 —, pope, 20
 Mardonius, tutor of Julian, 295
 Mareotis, clergy in the, 59, 60, 67, 145, 146, 151, 152; commission against St. Athanasius, 166, 167, 176, 189
 Marianæ, a house near Constantinople, ii. 74
 Marina, sister of Theodosius II., ii. 282, 382
 Marinianus, bishop of Synnada, ii. 485–487
 —, a “vicar” in Spain, 463
 Marinus, bishop of Arles, 20, 28
 —, Arian bishop of Constantinople, 521
 —, a count, ii. 156
 Maris, bishop of Chalcedon, 79, 97, 151, 179, 309
 —, bishop of Dolicha, 405
 — of Persia, ii. 328, 434, 435, 443, 536, 550. *See* Ibas
 —, apostle of Edessa, 201
 Marius Mercator, ii. 161, 162, 165, 166, 214, 216, 265, 276, 277, 285, 303, 331, 359
 Mark, St., and Alexandria, 105, 117, 118, 310; Liturgy of, 43; “pall” of, 116
 —, bishop of Arethusa, 179, 181, 219, 258; his creed, 266; 295; tortured, 308
 Marmora, sea of, 128
 Marmoutier (Majus Monasterium), 400
 Marriage with Pagans, 29; second marriages, 36; at Neocesarea, 38; at Nicæa, 109; in Persia, 202; ii. 25, 122, 200, 222, 430; and *see* Celibacy of clergy
 Marseilles, 27; ii. 24, 124, 230, 234, 247, 400
 Martial, master of the offices, ii. 469
 Martin, abbé, ii. 489, 491
 —, archimandrite at Constantinople, ii. 497, 502, 513
 —, St., 155; scourged, 233; 397; early history, 398–400; bishop of Tours, 400; visit to Valentinian, 400, 401; St. Martin’s pine, 401; and the Priscillianists, 466–470; 539; aged 80...ii. 4; interceded for Priscillianists, 11; death, 19, 20; 124, 416
 Martinian, a notary, 272
 —, a priest, ii. 423, 424
 Martinus (Martinian), bishop of Milan, ii. 348
 Martyn, Henry, ii. 105
 Martyrius, bishop of Antioch, 440
 —, a cleric, ii. 23
 —, Eusebian envoy, 166, 195
 —, bishop of Marcianopolis, 440
 Martyrs, commemoration of, 37; at Sebaste, 44; property of, 49
 Maruthas, bishop of Martyropolis (Tagrit), ii. 95, 145
 Mary, the Blessed Virgin, 477, 523; ii. 176, 262–264, 269, 324, 528. *See* Theotocos
 —, a lady of Carthage, ii. 407
 —, queen of Scots, Court of, ii. 38
 Mass, word used by St. Ambrose, 485
 Master General of the Army, 506, 536
 — of the Offices, 350, 424, 506, 516
 Maternus, bishop of Cologne, 20, 27
 Maundy Thursday, 204; ii. 386
 Maurice, emperor, ii. 157
 Mauritania, 335; ii. 111
 Maurus, bishop of Utica, 24
 Maxentius, emperor, son of Maximian, overcome by Constantine, 2; not regretted, 3; seditious letters against, 16
 Maxido, a circumcellion, 210
 Maximian (Maximin), bishop of Anazarbus, ii. 241, 365
 —, bishop of Bagai, ii. 112–114
 —, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 351, 353, 356–359, 360, 361, 372–375, 386, 433
 —, Donatist martyr, 211
 —, ex-Donatist, bishop of Bagai or Vaga, ii. 111
 —, bishop of the Donatist secession at Carthage, 539; ii. 130. *See* Maximianists
 —, emperor, abdication of, 2, 6; buildings at Milan, 6; his daughter, 21; called Hercules, 70
 —, a presbyter at Constantinople, ii. 239
 Maximianists, Donatist sect, ii. 4, 21, 109, 152
 Maximin, Daza, emperor, nephew of Diocletian, 2; colleague of Licinius, 4; defeated by Licinius, 5; death, 5; policy barbarous, 7, 304; persecution, 78, 134, ii. 105
 —, bishop of Treves, 155, 178
 —, an Arian bishop, opponent of Augustine, ii. 304, 305
 Maximus, usurping emperor, 460, 462, 463, 466–470, 501, 502, 508
 —, bishop of Antioch, ii. 492, 498, 523, 524, 534–536, 540, 546
 — the Cynic, schismatic bishop of Constantinople, 414, 424, 426, 446, 447, 453
 —, bishop of Jerusalem, 149, 171, 172, 199, 258; ii. 517
 —, bishop of Naples, 232, 233, 331
 —, bishop of Turin, ii. 246
 —, a bishop accused at Circa, 14
 —, abbot at Antioch, ii. 388, 392, 393, 498
 —, counsel for Donatists, 23
 —, philosopher at Ephesus, 297, 300, 303, 339
 —, a messenger, ii. 362
 Mayo, county, ii. 416
 Mayor of the Palace, ii. 3
 Mechir (February), 321; ii. 279
 Megalius, primate of Numidia, ii. 8
 Melania, a correspondent of St. Augustine, ii. 215

- Melchiades. *See* Miltiades
- Meletius, bishop of Antioch, 140, 290; his sermon, 292; 319, 324, 342; exiled, 355; third exile, 374; 380, 381, 404, 425-427; ii. 39, 299
- , bishop of Lycopoli, 53-55; his followers denounced Alexander, 56; Hosius ordered to inquire into their conduct, 70; Nicene Council on, 99, 104, 114; in Thebaid, 135, 147, 151; opposed St. Athanasius, 144, 150; joined by Ischyrras, 145; acknowledged at Tyre, 153; letters to Syria, 171; reconciliations, 200
- Meliphthongus, a bishop, ii. 456
- Melitene, 290
- Memon, object of alleged outrage, ii. 69, 70
- , bishop of Ephesus, ii. 241, 312, 313, 319, 325, 335, 337, 338, 378, 538
- , a sacrist at Constantinople, ii. 452, 454
- Memor, bishop, ii. 220
- Memphis, 114, 423
- Menas, an adherent of Arius, 61
- Menophantus, bishop of Ephesus, 79, 185
- Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, 16, 17, 213; ii. 152
- Mercurinus. *See* under Auxentius II.
- Mercurius, a treasurer, 163
- Merida, 423
- Merocles (Myrocles), bishop of Milan, 27, 28
- Meropius, a philosopher, 216
- Meros, 311
- Merovingians, ii. 3
- Mesopotamia, 79, 101, 166, 202
- Messalians, 522, 523; ii. 240, 255, 332. *See* also Euchites
- Methodists, ii. 38
- Metrodorus, a philosopher, 216
- Metrophantes, bishop of Byzantium, 81
- Metropolitans, 397, ii. 534, 539, 544, 545
- Metz, ii. 508
- Michael the drunkard, 340
- Michael, an idol, 118
- Michul, an Irish chieftain, ii. 416
- Milan, edict of, 4, 49; abdication of Maximian at, 6; Bishop Merocles, 27; Cæcilian summoned thither, 32; Bishop Eustorgius, 79; glories of, 180; bishop at Sardica, 181; council in year 345... 195; 206; council in year 347...217; council in year 355...228; churches at, 229; Constantine and Julian at, 301; Hilary, the deacon at, 331; Hilary at, in year 364...349; St. Ambrose, Bishop, 385; Valentinian II. at, 395; St. Martin at, 399; Priscillianists at, 423; council in year 382...446; St. Ambrose and Justina at, 483; St. Augustine at, 492, 494; death of Theodosius the Great at, 543; Ambrosian Library at, ii. 57; Alaric approaching, ii. 119
- , bishops of (*see* also under each name)
- Merocles (Myrocles), before 314...27; Eustorgius, before 325...79; Protasius, before 343...180; Dionysius, before 355...228; Auxentius, 355...233; Ambrose, 374...385 [Auxentius II. Mercurinus, before 386...488]; Simplicianus, 397... ii. 18; Venerius, 401...ii. 107; Martinian, before 431...ii. 348
- Miletus, ii. 86
- Milevum, ii. 110
- Military service and Christianity, 29, 399
- Millenarians, ii. 22
- Milman, 222, 298, 519; ii. 121, 414
- Miltiades, pope, 2, 20, 22; ii. 152
- Milton, his Arianism, 71
- Milvian Bridge, 2
- Miracles of St. Gregory of Neocæsarea, 37; in Georgia, 130, 131
- Miran, King of Georgia, 131
- Misphas, a fortress, ii. 102
- Mithra, 300
- Mixed chalice, ii. 20
- Mocius, St., church of, ii. 334
- Modestus, prefect, 367, 371, 374
- Moesia, 153, 164, 180, 280, 459
- Monasticism, origin, 131; estimate of, 132; inaugurated in Europe by St. Athanasius at Rome, 169; adopted in West by Eusebius of Vercellæ, 226; in Egypt, 243, 244, 540, 541; in Egypt and Syria, 368; in Gaul, 400; double monasteries, 481; in Africa, ii. 6, 10; abuses, 53; Nitrian monks, 54-59; basketwork, 59; fanaticism, 90; in Scetic desert, 144, 245; St. Jerome on, 177; Pelagius on, 177, 178; at Bethlehem, 200, 230; Cassian's monastic institutes, 231; sleepless monks, 239; at Lerins, 247; subjection to bishops, 533
- Monnica, St., mother of St. Augustine, 492-494; at Ostia, 500; ii. 6
- Monophysitism, ii. 380-382, 384, 385, 519, 549, 550
- Monsters, ii. 126
- Montanistic fanaticism, 15, 34, 226; ii. 255
- Montanus, a silentiary, 224, 239
- Montensians. *See* Hill folk
- Montfaucon, ii. 40, 47, 80, 100, 104, 161
- Mopsucrene, 302
- Mopsuestia, 195, 219
- Mordecai, 203
- Morphe, St. Paul's use of, 89
- Mosæus (Moses), bishop of Antarat, ii. 389
- Moselle, the, 155
- Moses, ii. 67
- , a monk, 377
- Mourning for the dead, ii. 33
- Mozley, Dr., 74, 516; ii. 116, 131, 170, 218, 226
- Muronius, Bishop, ii. 20
- Mursa, 151, 219
- Musæus of Thessalonica, 188

Muses, 129

Musonianus Strategius, 141, 181

Musonius, Bishop, 268, 277

Mutilation to avoid episcopate, ii. 56

Mutus, a gladiator, 15

"My kitten, live your own life," 479

Myrocles, bishop of Milan, 20

N

Nabor, Milanese martyr, 229, 496

Naboth, 495

Naissus, a place, 184

Nantes, edict of, ii. 116

Naples, 232, 331

Napoleon I., ii. 236

Narbonne, 238; ii. 419

Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, ii. 9

—, bishop of Neronias, 157, 179, 185

Narses, a count, 469

—, priest and monk, ii. 485

Nature, meaning of, ii. 382, 383, 385, 430, 431, 483; two natures, 456, 457; "in" or "of," 471, 519, 520, 529-531

Navigius, 499

Nazareth, 124

Neale, Dr. J. M., 64, 97, 528; ii. 542

Neander, 159, 160, 465; ii. 53

Nebrius, a friend of St. Augustine, 494

—, a prefect, ii. 36

Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 407

Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, 433, 440, 456, 457, 520; ii. 27, 36, 45, 69, 88, 299

—, a pagan at Carthage, ii. 133

Nemthur, alleged birthplace of St. Patrick, ii. 415

Neocæsarea, council of, 34; 388

—, on the Euphrates, 44

Neon, bishop of Seleucia, 281

Neophyte, 361, 433; ii. 81, 122

Neoplatonism, its influence on word "ousia," 90; on word "homousion," 91; three hypostases, 93; 297, 300, ii. 141, 142, 194

Nepotian, nephew of Constantine, 219

Nero, 21, 126

Neronias, 157

Nestorian controversy, 68, 327

Nestorianism, link with Pelagianism, ii. 161, 162, 229, 276, 333; 164; its rise, 254; anticipations of, 256; anticipatory patristic refutations of, 257, 258; inducements to, 259; Cyril's anathemas against, 294, 295; Nestorian communion in the East, 385, 412; end of the controversy, 386; Synodicon, 387, 388; survey of, 393; statement of Capreolus, 395, 396; account by Socrates, 408; issue, 425; 482; anti-Nestorian feeling at Chalcedon, 517

Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 254; as a persecutor, 255, 256; on Theotocos,

264; letter to Celestine, 285; Emperor's letter to Cyril, 298; sermons at Constantinople, 299, 300; his counter anathemas, 301, 302; started for Ephesus, 312; at Ephesus, 313, 314; would not call "a child" God, 314; deposed, 323, 335; in retirement, 353; likened to Judas, 357; spoken of as "Saint," 385; near Antioch, 387; narrative of his sufferings, 387, 388, 430; mentioned by St. Vincent, 398; Socrates on, 408; his end, 411, 412; character and position, 425; anathematized by Eutyches, 481; and Ibas, 536

Newman, J. H., connected Arius with Paul of Samosata, 58; description of Nicæa, 76; on Nicene use of technical terms, 89; on St. Athanasius, 142; on St. Athanasius and Marcellus, 157; on council of Sirmium, 221; on semi-Arianism, 247, 248, 263; on transfer of Eudoxius, 257; on Liberius, 262; on Eusebius of Cæsarea, 170; on Arian "imperceptible centre," 294; on the law of reunion, 360; St. Martin, 467; on St. Chrysostom, ii. 86, 91, 92, 104; 158, 170, 171, 178, 242, 298, 427

Newton, Sir Isaac, 71

New Troy, 311

Nicarete, a faithful woman, ii. 88

Nicasius, bishop of Divio, 80

—, bishop of Reims, ii. 125

Nicæa, its climate, situation, and importance, 76; Bishop Theognis, 79, 264; first proposed as site for the council of 451, ii. 509-511

Nice, in Thrace, 274, 358

Nicene Council, its language on weak Christians, 44; on Meletius, 54; summoned by advice of Hosius, 70; description of, 71; number of bishops at, 77; members described, 78, 79; date of opening day, 80; question of presidency, 80; preliminary discussions, 83, 84; modern charge against, 89; its real moral aim, 93; its decision Scriptural, 93, 94; mistakes to be avoided, 94, 95; the Creed, 95, 96; the anathemas, 96; settlement of Meletian troubles and Easter controversy, 99; the canons, 102, 116, 177; its greatness, 110; date of close, 111; Meletian bishops, 117; its Creed produced at Milan, 229; relation to Constantinopolitan Creed, 436, 437; the eighth canon, ii. 9; on marriage of clergy, 15; the sixth canon, 197, 534-536; alleged in case of Apirius, 248; decision about creed at Ephesus, 331; 481, 521, 522, 528; form at Chalcedon, 530, 531; the fourth canon, 539; the seventh canon, 546, ii. 244, 549

Nicetas, bishop of Romatiana, ii. 145

Nicocles, a grammarian, 296

Nicolaus, a priest, ii. 100

Nicomedia, an edict of toleration promul-

- gated at, 6; Bishop Eusebius, 62, 79; loved by Diocletian, 63; churches at, 2, 6, 125; persecution at, 10, 63; Scriptures burnt at, 12; 84, 145; earthquake at, 264; Julian at, 296; Valens at, 367; ii. 45, 73, 102, 360, 534
- Nicopolis, 390
- Niebuhr, 45
- Nigra, a gate at Treves, 155
- Nile, 134, 135, 171, 322, 355, 529; Nile-gauge, 532
- Nilus, an Egyptian monk, ii. 144
- Nimrod, ii. 427
- Nina (Ninia), 130, 131
- Ninian, St., ii. 416
- Nisibis, 79, 202; ii. 96
- Nismes council, 539
- Nitria, 131, 243, 540; ii. 54-59, 190, 194
- Nola. *See* Paulinus
- Nonnus of Edessa, ii. 498
- Norwich, 188
- Notary, ii. 146
- Novatians: their principles, 108, 330, ii. 123, 164, 238; emperors and, 356, 525, ii. 255, 256; Socrates and, ii. 508, 509; Nicene canons and, 99, 108; Pacian and, 397; in Asia Minor, 79, 521, ii. 241; at Constantinople, 356, 357, 521, ii. 140, 238-240, 255, and *see* under Constantinople, Novatian bishops of; at Rome, i. 510
- Novempopulanian, ii. 125
- Numidia, 13, 16, 399; ii. 5, 110, 201, 252
- Nundinarius, a Donatist deacon, 19
- Nunechius, bishop of Laodicea, ii. 488, 545
- Nyssa, 378
- O
- Oak, synod of the, ii. 66; orientals at, ii. 344
- Oasis, the, ii. 41
- Obsequia*, 47
- Oceanus, a friend of St. Jerome, ii. 52
- Odyssey loved by Julian, 295
- Oliphant, Mrs., 244
- Olympias, deaconess, ii. 86
- , a lady at Constantinople, ii. 36, 48, 88, 89, 94, 95, 103, 104
- Olympius, bishop of Aeni, 191
- , a bishop, 23
- , another bishop, ii. 538
- , an officer, ii. 134, 136
- , a philosopher, 530
- Oman, C. W. C., ii. 236
- Ommannay, prebendary, ii. 398
- Omophorion*, ii. 57
- Onager, a young profligate, 192
- Onesiphorus, bishop of Iconium, ii. 485, 486, 488, 520, 544
- Opportunism, ii. 197
- Optatus on the Donatist schism, 17, 207, 211, 334-336; on the alms of Constans, 209
- Optatus, Donatist bishop of Tamugada, ii. 21, 152
- , pagan prefect, ii. 87
- Optimus, 440
- Orange, its bishop represented at Arles, 28
- Orationes missæ*, ii. 132
- Orbis terrarum*, meaning of, ii. 21, 149
- Orchan, a Turkish conqueror, 82
- Ordination, grace of, ii. 198; forcible, ii. 538
- Oresius, bishop of Marseilles, 27
- Orestes, prefect, ii. 193-195, 274, 425
- Oribasius, 302
- Orient, the, 141, 320, 438; churches of the, ii. 308; position at Ephesus, 337; depuration to Chalcedon, 344-352; at close of Ephesus, 353; four shades of opinion about Cyril, 365; acceptance of Reunion, 376
- Origen, his language claimed by Arians, 58; step of Demetrius against, 61; admitted homoousion, 97; 118; used the word "dogma," 399; well spoken of by St. Jerome, 477; controversy upon, 482, 541; the Hexapla, ii. 129; ii. 263, 266, 399
- Origenism, ii. 49; points of controversy, ii. 50; 70, 72, 125, 179
- Originale peccatum, ii. 170, 200, 205
- Orion, 309
- Orontes, 374, 504
- Orontius, a Pelagianizing bishop, ii. 221, 276
- Orosius, Paulus, ii. 120, 137, 138, 161, 179, 182; his defence, 185; 200
- Orsisius, 243
- Osiris, 529
- Osrhoene, 508, 524, 528
- Ostia, 28, 500
- Ostian road, 127; ii. 137
- Ostiary, a porter, ii. 25
- Ostrogoths, 503; ii. 41
- Oswald, St., 163
- Otreius, Bishop, 440
- Ousia*, its meaning, 89-92, 96, 97, 325, 326, 422; ii. 409
- Oxyrinchos, 242
- P
- Pabau, 135
- Pachomius, 134, 135, 169, 243
- Pacian, bishop of Barcelona, 397
- Pædagogus, 295, ii. 45
- Paganism, serious attempt to overthrow it by Theodosius I., 50, 532; its tenacity, 51, 535; under Constantine, 124, 125; under Constans, 178; 167, 299, 305, 307; under Gratian, 397; in Africa, 534; survivals of, ii. 6-8, 22, 23; 136
- Palæbisca, a town, ii. 143
- Palæmon, a hermit, 134
- Palatines, civil officers, ii. 336
- Palestine, Christians of, in persecution, 10;

- represented at Nicæa, 78; recluses in, 541; Nitrian monks in, ii. 58
- Palinode, a letter of submission, 136
- Palladius, an Illyrian bishop, 441-443
- , Irish bishop, ii. 234, 235, 415
- , bishop of Helenopolis, 422; ii. 28, 36, 46, 49, 57, 60, 63, 67, 70, 75, 79, 84, 85, 93, 96, 98, 101, 102
- , a prefect at Alexandria in 373...376
- , a prefect in 418...ii. 211, 349
- Pallium, of Theodosius, ii. 345; of St. Mark, i. 116
- Palm-tree bark, ii. 193, 194
- Palmyra, ii. 102
- Pambon, 244
- Pammachius, son-in-law of Paula, 538; ii. 52, 54, 162, 167
- Pamphilus, a Palestinian Christian, 10
- , the friend of Eusebius, 97, 118; ii. 51
- Pamphylia, 67, 77, 357, 523; ii. 332
- Pancras, St., 11
- Pancratius, bishop of Libyas, ii. 488
- , a priest, 226, 232
- , a martyr, 11
- Pannonia, 80, 218, 398
- Panobius, bishop of Hierapolis, ii. 422, 429, 540
- Panopolis, ii. 411
- Pansophius, Bishop, ii. 44, 83
- , pædagogus, ii. 45, 46
- Papal claims. *See* Primacy
- Paphnutius, a confessor, 78, 109, 149, 479
- Parabolani*, ii. 195, 312, 479, 484, 487
- Pardons, sale of, ii. 246
- Paris, its bishop at Sardica, 181; Bibliothèque Nationale, 280; first council of, 285; leper at, 402; 460, ii. 317
- Parisian breviary, on St. Hilary, 352; ii. 307
- Parish, early meaning of word, 30; parochial system at Alexandria, 55; in later sense, ii. 242
- Parker, Mr. J. H., 127
- Parma, 396
- Parmenian, St. Augustine against, ii. 24
- Parthenius, priest, ii. 358
- Pascal, ii. 171, 401
- Paschasius, bishop of Lilybæum, and papal representative at Chalcedon, ii. 422, 510, 511, 516, 518, 519, 523, 524, 536, 545, 546
- , an excommunicated person, 445
- Passion of our Lord, Augustine on, ii. 6, 7
- Pastilli*, meaning of, ii. 70
- Paternus, a bishop of Braga, ii. 26
- , a priest, ii. 92
- Patriarch, 437, 439, ii. 442, 516
- , Jewish, ii. 192
- Patricius, father of St. Augustine, 492
- , "solicitor" for imperial treasury, 467
- , an imperial officer, 19
- Patrick, St., ii. 235, 414-418
- , a messenger, ii. 451
- Patripassianism, 358
- Patroclus, bishop of Arles, 27; ii. 210
- Patrophilus of Scythopolis, 65, 78, 140, 154, 232, 270, 272, 274
- Paul, St., church at Rome, 127; ii. 137; his Epistles, 498; ii. 37, 67, 86, 129, 181, 188, 199, 499, 533, 543
- , a bishop at Circa, 13, 15
- , bishop of Constantinople, 161, 164, 166, 179, 180, 181, 222; his expulsions summarized, 223; ii. 408
- , an Egyptian bishop, ii. 59, 60
- , bishop of Emesa, ii. 326, 344, 366-375, 435
- , bishop of Erythrum, ii. 143
- , bishop of Heraclea, ii. 71
- , a Libyan bishop, ii. 68, 77
- , bishop of Neocæsarea on the Euphrates, 44, 78
- , Novatian bishop of Constantinople, ii. 240
- , bishop of Tyre, 148
- of Samosata, 21, 33, 58, 68, 91, 176, 261; ii. 230, 255, 265, 299
- , a commissioner, 209, 334; ii. 151
- , the first hermit, 131
- , messenger, ii. 451
- , nephew of Cyril, ii. 350
- , a notary, called "The Chain," 163
- , a Palestinian Christian, 10
- Paula, a Roman lady, 454, 477, 481, 538; ii. 52
- Paulicians, 87, 510
- Paulillus, a lad, ii. 404
- Paulinianus, brother of St. Jerome, 542
- Paulinus of Antioch, 250, 291, 324; consecrated bishop, 329; 343; his orthodoxy, 346, 347; 380, 381; his relation to Rome, 386, 387; 406, 407, 445, 454, 525; death, 525; ii. 196
- of Nola, 539; ii. 4, 125, 139, 161, 163, 246
- of Treves or of Tibur, 201, 226
- of Tyre, 61, 65, 68, 78, 90, 141, 156, 157
- , secretary to St. Ambrose, 385; his life of St. Ambrose, 496; 518; ii. 14, 17, 145, 166, 167, 205, 206, 210
- Pavia, ii. 16
- Peace of Secontarurus, a place, 145
- Peace, relaxing influence of, ii. 533
- Pegasus, bishop of New Troy, 311
- Pelagianism, 87; ii. 110; the rise of, 159; source of the heresy, 161; link with Nestorianism, 161, 162, 276, 333; summary of early history, 164, 165; seven propositions of Cælestius, 167; *originale peccatum*, 170; on living without sin, 180, 181, 183; synod of Diospolis, 186-190; decline of, 199; modern forms of, 226; semi-Pelagianism, 232; Alleluia victory, 234; condemned at Ephesus, 330; settled, 402; Rome and, 403; and St. Leo, 418, 419

- Pelagius, bishop of Laodicea, 440
 —, heretic, 482; a British monk, ii. 161;
 at Rome, 161; his *Eulogiæ*, 161, 163,
 181; moral earnestness, 164; commen-
 tary on St. Paul, 165, 170, 211, 277;
 left Rome for Sicily and Africa, 166;
 letter to Demetrias, 177, 178; personal
 appearance, 182; at Jerusalem, 183, 201;
 at Diospolis, 186–190; subsequent activity,
 199; lost letter to St. Augustine, 203;
 209; his position in 418...215; disappear-
 ance from history, 225
 Pelusium, 199; ii. 102
 Pempton, near Constantinople, ii. 81
 Penal laws against heretics, ii. 254
 Penance, Pacian on, 397
Penates, 532; ii. 23
 Penitentiary priest, 527
 Penitents, three orders of, 35, 39, 519; ii.
 25, 109
 Pentadia, a deaconess, ii. 86, 89
 Pentalogus of Theodoret, ii. 359
 Pentapolis, 67, 104, 105, 147
 Pentateuch in heroic verse, 314
 Pentecost, ii. 246
 Perga, ii. 343, 485
 Pergamum, 297
 Periaptis, ii. 34
 Perigenes, bishop of Corinth, ii. 313
 Perinthus, 164
 Permission of evil, ii. 181
 Perpetua, St., ii. 405
 Persecution, date of the last, 2; experiences
 of, 10; by Licinius, 42
 —, attitude of Christian bishops to:
 Amphilocheus, 455, 459; Martin, 467–
 470, ii. 116; Ambrose, 501, 508; Gregory
 Nazianzen, 524, ii. 116; Chrysostom, ii.
 38, 116; Augustine, ii. 115, 116, 135;
 Cyril, ii. 191; Nestorius, ii. 254–256;
 Proclus, ii. 387; other fathers, ii. 116
 Persia, attack on Nisibis, 79; Bishop John,
 79; representatives at Jerusalem, 153;
 early Christian history of, 79, 202; war
 of Constantius, 270; 510, ii. 95, 145, 245
 Pessinus, 317, ii. 96
 Peter, St., first “St. Peter’s” at Rome, 126,
 169; ii. 7, 187; church of St. Peter and
 St. Paul at Constantinople, ii. 66; 129,
 137, 181, 185, 203, 371, 543
 Peter of Alexandria, 10, 16, 53
 — of Alexandria, successor to St. Atha-
 nasius, 376, 385, 410, 414, 415; date of
 death, 416
 —, an aged bishop, ii. 422
 —, archimandrite of Constantinople, ii.
 497
 —, Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna, ii.
 246
 —, messenger, ii. 451
 —, (Mongus), Monophysite, bishop at
 Alexandria, ii. 489
 —, Nestorian bishop, ii. 359
 Peter, a priest, ii. 319, 323
 —, a reader, ii. 195
 Petilian of Cirta, ii. 24, 113, 150
 Petra, ii. 102, 387, 429
 Petronius, abbot, 243
 —, minister of state, 356
 Pharaoh, 216; ii. 407, 427
 Pharetrius, archbishop of Cæsarea, ii. 90,
 91
 Phennesus, 377
 Pherbutha, a Persian martyr, 205
 Philadelphia, 342
 Philagrius, prefect of Egypt, 152, 167, 168,
 223
 Philastrius, bishop of Brescia, 397, 442
 Phileas, bishop of Thmuis, 10, 54
 Philetus, ii. 151
 Philip the fair, 467
 —, prefect, 221, 223
 —, priest, ii. 311, 327
 — II., 543
 — of Side, ii. 238, 276, 287, 351
 Philippopolis in Thrace, 183, 184, 190,
 208; ii. 22, 253
 Philo, ii. 16, 193
 — of Constantinople, ii. 250
 Philochares, 378
 Philogonius, bishop of Antioch, 68, 78
 Philoromus, an Egyptian Christian, 10
 Philosopher converted at Nicæa, 82
 Philostorgius on Eusebius of Nicomedia, 62;
 120; on Acacius, 170; on Theophilus
 the Indian, 243, 263; on Ætius, 250;
 on Liberius, 257; on Eudoxius, 257; on
 Ulphilas, 280; on Eunomius, 287; on
 murder of George, 310; 333, 341, 342, 367
 Philoxenus, a Roman presbyter, 169, 170,
 181
 Philumenus, a rebel, 145
 Phinehas, ii. 341
 Phœbadius of Agen, 256, 268, 275, 276,
 397, 398
 Phœnicia, represented at Nicæa, 78; ii. 89,
 94, 100
 Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, 193, 217,
 228; his heresy, 328; 403, 526; ii. 257,
 266, 271, 398
 Photius of Constantinople, ii. 72, 200, 359
 — (Photinus) employed by Nestorius, ii.
 273, 280
 —, bishop of Tyre, ii. 439, 441, 443, 487,
 490, 492, 528, 534, 536, 544
 Phrygia, 262, 311; ii. 41
Physis, 89; and *see* Nature
 Picenum, 277
 Picts, ii. 234, 235
 Pierius, bishop, 55
 Pilgrimages, 122, 481, ii. 534
 Pillars of Hercules, ii. 145
 Pincian hill, ii. 137
 Pinianus, a correspondent of St. Augustine,
 ii. 215
 Pinnes, a monastic superior, 148

- Pior, a Nitrian monk, 243
 Pisa, council in 1409...ii. 538
 Pisidia, 357, 524
 Pistus, an Arian bishop, 165-167
 —, bishop of Athens, 179
 Pityus, on the Euxine, ii. 104
 Placidia, "the Lodgings of," ii. 66; 305
 Plantagenet, 348, ii. 137
 Plato, 295, 299; platonized paganism, 4;
 ii. 16, 142, 434, 490
Pleroma, 89
 Plintha, a general, ii. 359
 Plotinus, ii. 194
 Plurality of episcopal consecrators, 29
 Pluto, 529
 Plymouth Brethren, ii. 214
 Poederos, bishop of Heraclea, 79
 Poemen, a bishop, ii. 77
 —, a monk, ii. 245
 Poemenius an Anomoean, 342
 Poets, Christian: Arius, 64, 409; Apollinares, 314; Damasus, 476; Ambrose, 492, 495, ii. 288, 356; Augustine, 17, ii. 6; Prudentius, 470, ii. 120; Gregory Nazianzen, 409, ii. 461; Endocia, ii. 237, 238
 Poitiers, 173, 221
 Pollentia, ii. 119
 Polycarp, St., martyrdom, 16; Easter controversy, 100; Gloria Patri, 197
 Polycrates, his share in Easter controversy, 100
 Ponte Molle, 2
 Pontianus, case of, in 235...49
 Pontifex Maximus, 45
 Pontitianus, 498
 Pontius, a bishop, 334
 Pontus, capital of, 37; Christians tortured, 38; represented at Nicæa, 78; province of, 107; Bishop Paul banished to, 161; St. Basil on, 368; ii. 27, 105
 Pope, as a title, 106; special title of bishops of Alexandria, 135; 63, 64, 78, 79, ii. 194, 374, 491; "*the Pope*" first used of Bishop of Rome, ii. 26. *See* Primacy
 Porphyrius, bishop at Antioch, ii. 93-95, 144, 196
 —, bishop of Gaza, ii. 38
 Porphyry, ii. 398, 439, 494
 —, the Neoplatonist, 297
 — pillar at Constantinople, 129, ii. 76
 Posidonius, deacon and priest, ii. 287, 288, 291
 Possidius, bishop of Calama, ii. 9, 11, 12, 20, 112, 404
 Posthumianus of Gaul, ii. 59
 Postumianus, consul, ii. 443
 Potamius, bishop of Lisbon, 253
 Potammon of Heraclea, 78, 149, 170
 —, an Egyptian bishop, ii. 296
 Potemon, 521
 Potitus, presbyter, ii. 415
Præfectus urbi, 105
Prætextatus, a prefect, 363, 364, 471
Prævaricatio, ii. 216
 Prayers for the dead, 524
 Praylius, bishop of Jerusalem, ii. 207, 430
 Preaching, of St. Athanasius, 142; African usage, ii. 5; St. Augustine, 6, 7; St. Chrysostom, 31-36, 357; St. Proclus, 269, 270
 Predestination, ii. 19, 217-220, 400
 Prefectures of the Empire, 30
 Prenetus, a town, ii. 73
 Presbyterianism, so-called orders, 59, 70; connexion with Arianism, 72; connexion with Aerians, 524
 Presbyters at Nicæa, 78; African preaching usage, ii. 5
 Priests of the provinces, phrase meaning bishops, ii. 133
 Primacy of Rome, points bearing on, 23, 27, 29, 30, 81, 103, 407; sixth Nicene Canon, 104; letter of Julius to Eusebians, 177; Hosius at Sardica, 184; appellate jurisdiction, 186; Sardican letter to Julius, 189; third Constantinopolitan canon, 439; ii. 26; St. Chrysostom's view, 82; Pope Innocent and the Easterns, 84; Innocent and Gaul and Spain, 121; the question of St. Chrysostom, 145; African Synodal letter to Innocent, 201; Innocent's replies, 203, 204; Zosimus on Pelagius, 208, 209; *causa finita est*, 215; Apiarius, 248-253; Celestine's letter to Nestorius, 289, 290; letter to Ephesus, and reply, 327, 330; Celestine's assumptions, 357; Leo's development, 413; case of Chelidonius, 420, 421; St. Leo on appellate jurisdiction, 496; Theodoret's letter to Leo, 498-500; Leo's failure to impress Theodosius, 502; Roman deputies at Chalcedon, 516, 520, 524, 526, 545; the Tome at Chalcedon, 532; Leo's pronouncement about Theodoret, 536; question of Primacy at Chalcedon, 543-548
 Primianus, a Donatist bishop, 539; ii. 148; his sect, 4, 21, 109, 151
 Principia, adopted daughter of St. Jerome's friend Marcella, ii. 137
 Prisca, Latin version of Nicene Canons, 105
 Priscian, a bishop, 452
 Priscillian, ii. 124, 179
 Priscillianism, 422-424, 463-465, 515, 516; ii. 11, 25, 26, 399
 Proæresius, 314
 Probatius, 345
 Probianus, proconsul in Africa, 25
 Probus, a prefect, 385
 Procla, deaconess, ii. 86
 Proclus, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 37, 238; his great sermon, 269, 270; 351, 386, 390, 393, 409, 411, 423, 429, 430, 434, 436, 447, 534, 538, 539, 547
 —, proconsul, ii. 472

Proconsular Asia, 67, 107
 Procopius, a kinsman of Julian, 355, 356 ;
 ii. 408
 —, a Palestinian Christian, 10
 Proculeianus, Donatist bishop of Hippo, ii.
 5, 13, 113, 135
 Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, ii. 124
 Projectus, bishop representing Celestine at
 Ephesus, ii. 311, 327
 —, bishop in Gaul, ii. 420
 Property of the Church, 21, 36; of martyrs,
 49
 Propontis, Sea of Marmora, 128, 180; ii.
 410, 515
Prosopon, 389; ii. 260; *prosopa*, 194, 389,
 ii. 279
 Prosper, author of the Chronicle, ii. 231,
 234, 399, 400, 401; secretary of pope
 Leo, 403; 412; silence on St. Patrick,
 414
 Protasius, bishop of Milan, 180
 —, martyr, 496
 Proterius, bishop of Capua, 27
 Protogenes, bishop of Sardica, 79, 181, 182,
 185
 —, a presbyter, 375
 Provinces of the vicarius urbis, 105; equiva-
 lent to dioceses, 107; provincial synods,
 174
Provoco as a technical term, 465
 Prudentius, 470; ii. 120
 Psalms translated into heroic verse, 314;
 quoted, 319; St. Ambrose on, ii. 17; 105,
 106; Athanasius and reading of, i. 240
 Psammathia, a suburb of Nicomedia, 145
 Psathyrians, 521
 Psilanthropism, 157; ii. 267
 Ptemencyrcis on the Nile, 148
 Ptolemais, ii. 49, 142, 344
 Publia, 320, 405
 Publicola, a layman, ii. 23
 Pudens, 126
 Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II., ii. 236,
 243, 383, 360, 372, 373, 393, 476, 489,
 493, 497, 501, 506, 509, 524, 533
 Puller, Father, 381, 387, 396, 447
 Purim, ii. 193
 Puritan names in African Church, ii. 111
 Purpurius, bishop of Limata, 14, 18
 Pusey, Dr., 225
 Pusices, 204
 Puteoli, 395, 396
 Pyrenees, 219; ii. 145

Q

Quadi, 383
Quæstor, 350, ii. 28
 Quartodecimans, 100, 101, 521; ii. 140, 241,
 256, 330
Quicunque, the, 91, 189, 410, 411, 447; ii.
 207, 331, 381, 398

Quietism of Euchites, 522
 Quintianus, Bishop, 184
 Quintus, an apostate, 16
 Quirinus, Church of, 167
 Quirius, a corrupted form of Ischyrras, 181
 " *Quod semper*," ii. 247, 397
 Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage, ii. 405,
 406
 —, an African bishop, ii. 111

R

Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, ii. 244, 355, 367,
 377, 390, 434, 435
 Radagaisus, the Goth, ii. 120, 121, 137
 Raids of barbarians, ii. 144
 Ramsay, Professor, 34
 Ravenna, 181, 267; ii. 23, 97, 117, 118,
 134, 154, 222, 246, 500
 Readers, 13, 19, 198, 208, 296, 456, ii. 83,
 111, 252
 Rebaptism, 213, 289; ii. 22, 114
 Reccared, the Visigoth, 388
 Red Rocks, near Milvian Bridge, 2
 Red Sea, 171, 216
 Reims, 27, 357, ii. 125
 Relics, 122, 296, 310, 319, 386, 468, 496;
 ii. 39, 40, 74, 125, 126, 127, 129, 137,
 332, 410
 Renatus, presbyter, ii. 472, 479, 500
 Rendall, Dr., 298, 304
 Rephidim, ii. 62
 Reservation of the Holy Eucharist, ii. 57,
 79
 Restituta, basilica, ii. 20, 107
 Restitutus, bishop of Carthage, 268, 274
 —, bishop of London, 28
 —, priest, ii. 112
 —, priest at Hippo, ii. 154, 155
 Reunion, the formulary of, ii. 368, 369,
 531
 Rheginus, bishop of Constantia, ii. 313,
 325, 331
 Rheticius, bishop of Autun, 20, 21, 27, 478
 Rhetorius, messenger, ii. 451
 Rhodes, ii. 312
 Rhodope, 191
 Riches, ii. 175
 Ricimer, ii. 138
 Riez, in Provence, ii. 231, 419
 Riparius, priest, ii. 126
 Riviera, 399
 Robertson, Canon, 317
 Rock in St. Peter's confession, ii. 372
 Rogatianus, 334
 Romanianus, 493, 499
 Romanus, count, 532
 —, deacon, 10
 Romatiana, near Sardica, ii. 145
 Rome, Cæcilian summoned thither by Con-
 stantine, 32; Agapæ at, 37; diaconate
 at, 40; churches at, 55, 126; view of

- marriage at, 110; council summoned by Julius at, 176; St. Athanasius at, 196; condition of Catholics in year 355-356 at, 236; condition of Church in year 366 at, 361; council in year 368...365; Priscillianists at, 423; relation to Antioch, ii. 39; taken by Alaric, 137; council in 313...152; synod in 430...288; Tome of St. Leo read in Advent, 475. *See* Primacy
- Rome, bishops of (*see* also under each name): Miltiades (Melchiades), before 312...2; Silvester, 314...28; Marcus, 20; Julius, 337...166; Liberius, 352...224 [Felix II., 356...236]; Damasus, 366...362 [Ursinus, 366...362]; Siricius, 384...478; Anastasius I., 398...ii. 26; Innocent I., 402...ii. 82; Zosimus, 417...ii. 204; Boniface I., 418...ii. 222; Celestine I., 422...ii. 246; Sixtus III., 432...ii. 362; Leo I., 440...ii. 413
- , bishops of the sects: (1) Donatists: Victor, 208; Claudian, 395, 510; (2) Luciferians: Aurelius, 395; Ephesius, 475; (3) Novatians: Leontius, 510
- , appeals to: Priscillian, 423; Celestius, ii. 204, 205; Pelagius, ii. 207; Apiarius, ii. 248, 250; Eutherius of Tyana and Helladius of Tarsus, ii. 378; Chelidonius of Besançon, ii. 420; Flavian of Constantinople, ii. 489, 496; Theodoret of Cyrrhos, ii. 499
- Romulus Augustulus, 349
- , a bishop, ii. 505
- Rouen, 26, ii. 125
- Rubicon, 267
- Rufinianum, ii. 344
- Rufinianus, a bishop, 232, 233, 333
- Rufinus of Aquileia, his summary of sixth Nicene canon, 105; on the true cross, 123; on Georgia, 131; on Ethiopia, 215; on the portent at Jerusalem, 317; 320; on Julian, 321; on Lucifer and Paulinus, 329; on St. Athanasius, 376; on Valens, 379; on St. Gregory Nazianzen, 413; on the Serapeum, 531; accused of Origenism, 541; ii. 49; and St. Jerome, 480, ii. 51, 52; Invectives, 54; 305; Latin history, 409
- , favourite of Theodosius, 516, 518
- , minister of Arcadius, ii. 3, 28, 66, 119, 139
- , the prefect, 122
- of Syria, ii. 162-164, 167
- Rufus, a bishop, 467
- , bishop of Thessalonica, ii. 222, 313, 319, 348, 386
- , a count, ii. 437
- Ruinart, 12, 203
- Rural dean, office of, 36
- Rusticianus, subdeacon, ii. 135
- Rutilius, ii. 138
- Sabaria, birthplace of St. Martin, 398
- Sabas, a Gothic martyr, 503
- , a monk, 375
- Sabbas, deacon, ii. 442
- Sabbatius, priest, 521, 522; ii. 140, 240
- Sabellianism, Bishop Alexander accused of, by Arius, 57; its materialism, 68; the orthodox accused of, by Arians, 73, 79, 91, 139, 140; relation of Marcellus to, 157; condemned at Antioch, 175; 358, 388, 451
- Sabinian, bishop of Perrha, ii. 429, 490, 498, 539, 540, 545
- Sabinus, an heretical bishop, 82
- , bishop of Placentia, 538
- , deacon, 382, 383
- , prefect of Licinius, 4
- , priest, ii. 227
- Saccophori*, the, 524
- Sacerdos, an attendant on Bishop Adelfius at Arles, 28
- Sacraments nullified by Pelagianism, ii. 227
- Sadoth (Chahdoust), bishop of Seleucia and martyr, 205
- Saints, growing devotion to, ii. 4; revelries on Saints' days, 6, 7
- Salad-eaters, low fellows, ii. 539
- Salama, Frumentius, 216
- Salamis (Constantia), ii. 313, 325, 331, 332; and *see* Epiphanius
- Salarian gate at Rome, ii. 137
- Salianus, a military commander, 192
- Sallust, author, ii. 176
- , a prefect, 320
- , priest, ii. 88
- Salona, death of Diocletian at, 6
- Salvian, ii. 24, 247, 304, 404, 405
- Salvianus, a bishop, 423
- Samaritans, ii. 102, 126, 192
- Samosata, ii. 308, 422, 540
- Samson, priest, ii. 239
- Samuel, priest, 380, ii. 436, 440-442
- , the prophet, ii. 67, 127, 243
- Sanctissimus, a priest at Antioch, 384
- Sanctuary, the right of, ii. 13, 41, 42
- Sangarum, 521
- Sapor II., King of Persia, 79, 202, 203, 270
- , an officer, 404
- Saracens, 377; ii. 144, 312
- Saragossa, 11, 28, 465; ii. 26
- Sarapammon, Egyptian bishop, 170
- Sarapion, an Anthropomorphite, ii. 53
- , bishop of Heraclea, ii. 37, 47, 64, 69, 93, 102
- , priest, ii. 68
- Sardica, Bishop Protogenes, 79; council in year 343...180; letters of council, 188; fifteenth canon, 214; ii. 22, 248, 408, 420, 421, 496
- Sardinia, 106, 226, 330
- Sarmates, an adherent of Arius, 61
- Sarmatians, ii. 83

Sarmation, disciple of Jovinian, ii. 14
 Sarum, 188
 Sarus, a Goth, ii. 134, 137
 Sasima, 390, 409, 429
 Sassanid kings in Persia, 202
 Saturday, Easter Eve, ii. 17
 Saturn, 531
 Saturninus, bishop of Arles, 225, 237, 238, 286, 350
 —, bishop of Marcianopolis, ii. 359
 —, martyr, ii. 13
 Sazan, an Ethiopian prince, 216, 243
 Scetis in Egypt, 131, 243, 540; ii. 54, 144, 231, 245, 401
 Scillitan martyrs, ii. 405
 Scilly Isles, 468
 Scotinus for Photinus, 195
 Scotland, ii. 198, 234, 235, 515
 Scots, Irish, ii. 415
 Scripture, Holy:—

I. Personal references:

Abraham, ii. 74, 357; Amalek, ii. 62; Apollos, ii. 67; Baruch, ii. 67; Belshazzar, ii. 141; David, 517; ii. 67, 357 (*see* Psalms); Eli, 151; Eliakim, ii. 356; Elijah, 524; ii. 67, 357; Elisha, 410, 497; ii. 67; Ezekiel, 207, 517; ii. 7; Haman, ii. 193; Herodias, ii. 77; Jeremiah, ii. 67; Jezebel, ii. 71; Jonah, 430; Jonathan, 461; Joseph, 216; Joshua, ii. 67; Lazarus the beggar, 538; Mordecai, 203; Moses, ii. 67; Nebuchadnezzar, ii. 407; St. Paul, ii. 37, 67, 181, 399 (*see* St. Paul); St. Peter, ii. 181, 372, 396 (*see* St. Peter); Pharaoh, 216; ii. 74, 407; Samuel, 431; ii. 67, 243; Sarah, ii. 74; Satan, ii. 141; Shebna, ii. 356; Solomon, ii. 206; Susanna, ii. 206; St. Thomas, ii. 269; Timothy, ii. 67; 399; Titus, ii. 67; woman of Thebez, 405

II. Subject references:

(i.) In vol. i.: texts against Arianism, 67; passages on Hypostasis, 325; sacred books destroyed in persecution, 12, 24; appeal of St. Athanasius to Scripture, 87; the sense of Scripture is Scripture, 87; copies ordered by Constantine, 129; by Constans, 178
 (ii.) Vol. ii.: canonical books, 20; St. Chrysostom on biblical study, 34; Scripture known by heart, 56; books burnt, 57; favourite texts of St. Chrysostom, 72; Scriptural allusions to "Monsters," 126; translations, 129, 130; in Donatist controversy, 151; Sermon on the Mount, 156; quoted for infant communion, 204; Romans, ii. 217; the Hebrews, 207; quotations at Carthage in 418...214; metrical paraphrases of, 237, 238; Theodore on the canon, 241; Nestorian

Scripture, Holy—*continued.*

exegesis, 300; St. Augustine's death-bed texts, 305, 306; passages used by Oriental deputies at Chalcedon, 348; quotations in St. Leo's Tome, 474

III. Textual references:

Gen. xviii. 21, ii. 341
 Exod. vii. 1, ii. 323
 Deut. xiii. 3, ii. 398
 1 Kings xxi. 3, 491
 2 Chron. xxvi. 18, 235
 Job xxxviii. 17 LXX., 267; xli. 1 LXX., ii. 183
 Ps. i. 1, ii. 149; xxvi. 5, ii. 149; xxxvii. 18 LXX., ii. 340; xlv., ii. 17; xlv. 7, ii. 105; lxxviii. 65, ii. 505; cxvi. 7, ii. 106; cxxxvi., 240; cl., ii. 335
 Prov. viii. 22, 291; xiii. 3 LXX., ii. 275
 Eccles. i. 2, ii. 42
 Isai. viii. 20 LXX., ii. 186
 Jer. xxxiv. 18, 524
 Ezek. ii. 7, ii. 7
 Dan. vii. 18, 187
 Joel ii. 25, 156
 Amos vi. 6, ii. 367
 Wisdom iv. 13, ii. 198
 St. Matt. i. 18, ii. 321; v. 9, ii. 112; v. 24, ii. 10; vi. 13, ii. 202; vii. 6, ii. 6; x. 37, ii. 293; xiii. 38, ii. 151; xvi. 16, ii. 531; xvi. 19, ii. 203, 413; xxv. 46, ii. 186; xxvii. 8, 160
 St. Luke xii. 57, ii. 402
 St. John i. 14, ii. 393; i. 18, 175, 286; vi. 6, ii. 424; xiv. 27, ii. 370; xiv. 28, 73; ii. 502; xx. 17, ii. 396
 Acts xv. 2, ii. 499; xx. 26, ii. 351; xx. 28, ii. 263; xxv. 16, 152
 Rom. i. 8, ii. 499; ii. 14, ii. 402; v. 12, ii. 172; v. 15, ii. 169, 172, 213; viii., ii. 243; viii. 29, 30, ii. 218; ix. 5, ii. 391; ix. 32, 33, ii. 174, 217; xii. 15, ii. 16; xiii. 13, 14, 499
 1 Cor. ii. 8, ii. 263, 343, 433; iv. 7, ii. 19; vi. 5, ii. 11; vii., 38; viii. 6, 65; x. 13, ii. 202; xv. 10, ii. 184; xv. 28, 156
 2 Cor. iii. 6, ii. 171; vi. 14, 188; xi. 26, ii. 100; xi. 28, 29, ii. 291; xii. 10, 487
 Gal. i. 8, ii. 397, 398; i. 9, 188; ii. 497
 Ephes. ii. 14, ii. 435
 Phil. ii. 3-5, ii. 148; ii. 7, ii. 273; ii. 13, ii. 228; ii. 30, ii. 195
 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12, 36; ii. 14; iv. 3, 37
 2 Tim. iv. 6; ii. 67
 Tit. ii. 13, ii. 283
 Heb. i. 3, 89; vi. 4, 39; xiii. 8, 67; xiii. 12, 121
 St. James ii. 10, ii. 180
 1 St. Peter ii. 22, ii. 434; iii. 16, ii. 470; iv. 1-3, ii. 7, 342; v. 3, ii. 252

Scripture, Holy—*continued*.

- 2 St. Peter i. 4, 89
 1 St. John i. 8, ii. 181; iii. 9, 514, ii. 181; iv. 3, ii. 26, 474; v. 20, 88
 IV. Commentaries on:
 Origen (Jerome), Homilies on the Song of Solomon, 477; Rheticius of Autun, on the Song of Solomon, 478; Greek and Latin commentaries on the Gospels read by Damasus, 476; Ambrose, ii. 16; Augustine, ii. 24; Chrysostom, Homilies on the Acts, Philippians, Colossians, Hebrews, ii. 31; Pelagius, *Eulogia* or Extracts from Scripture, ii. 161, 163, 181; Pelagius, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, ii. 165, 211, 277; Cyril, Commentary on the Hebrews, ii. 363
 Scythians, ii. 38, 83, 145
 Scythopolis, 65, 78, 140, 232; ii. 59
 Sebaste, the forty soldier martyrs of, 44; bishop Eustathius, 139, 290, 357
 Sebastian, a Manichean, 242
 Sechnal, hymn of, ii. 414
 Secontarurus, Peace of, a place, 145
Secretarium, a church room, ii. 107; a public hall, ii. 149; ii. 436
 Sectarian feuds, ii. 4
 Secularity, growth of, 107
 Secundianus, an Illyrian bishop, 441
 Secundinus, a Manichean, ii. 132
 Secundus, an adherent of Arius, 61, 165; at Nicæa, 78, 97; scorned Eusebius of Nicomedia, 98
 —, a correspondent of bishop Mensurius, ii. 152
 — of Tigisium, 14, 17
 Seghine, abbot, ii. 414
 Selenas (Selinas), 521
 Seleucia, Council in year 358...264; 281, 409
 —, a widow, ii. 91
 Seleucid kings, 318
 Seleucis I., 504
 Seleucus, a bishop, ii. 94
 —, bishop of Amasia, ii. 450, 459, 468, 484, 545
 — II., 293, 504
 Selsey, 188
 Semi-Arians, verbal heterodoxy of some, 35; 158; the Dedication Creed, 175; anathemas at Ancyra, 259; triumph in year 358...262; meetings in Asia Minor in year 366...357; reunion in year 366...360
 Semi-Pelagianism, ii. 18, 232, 400. *See* Pelagianism
 Senecio, Bishop, ii. 9
 Sennacherib, ii. 427
 Sens, 181
 Septimus, Bishop, ii. 419
 Septuagint, 156, 267, 291; ii. 129, 130, 183, 186, 275, 340
 Sepulchre, the Holy, 120, 122, 123; ii. 51
 Serapion, a bishop, 55
 —, another bishop, 223
 —, bishop of Thmuis, 135, 171, 224, 244, 245
 Serapis, temple of, 310, 311, 377, 529-531; ii. 408
 Serena, wife of Stilicho, ii. 2
 Sermon on the Mount, ii. 156
 Sermons at Rome, ii. 414. *See* Preaching
 Serras, a Libyan, 280
 Servan, disciple of Pelagius, ii. 235
 Servatius, bishop of Tongres, 217, 224, 268, 275, 398
 Sessorian palace at Jerusalem, 127
 Severa, 395
 Severian, bishop of Gabbala, ii. 45, 47, 49, 65, 66, 68, 73, 75, 78
 —, Pelagian bishop, ii. 234
 Severus, attendant on bishop Myrocles at Arles, 28
 —, a blind man, 496
 —, Emperor, 128
 —, priest, ii. 68
 Sextus, Petronius Probus, 361
 Shakespeare, 532
 Shebna, ii. 356
 Sherborne, 188
Sicarii, 33
 Sicca Veneria, ii. 248, 250
 Sicily, 79; Sicilian-Italian version of Nicene Canons, 104; 106, 359; ii. 139, 187
 Sicininus, 362
 Sicinnius, 456
 Side, council of, in 383...523
 Silentiary, 224, 536
 Silvanus, bishop of Cirta, 15, 19, 207
 —, bishop of Tarsus, 258, 270, 274, 278, 281, 341, 357, 360
 —, primate of Numidia, ii. 148, 156
 Silveria, a widow, ii. 86
 Silvester, Count, 211
 —, Pope, the true donation of Constantine, 21; sent deputies to Arles, 28; and to Nicæa, 77, 79, 81; 126
 Silvia of Aquitaine, 122
 Simon Magus, 228; ii. 151, 481
 Simonians, Nestorians, ii. 387
 Simony, 24, 388; ii. 43-45
 Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, 498; ii. 17, 18, 26, 217
 Simplicius, bishop of Autun, ii. 124
 Sinai, ii. 144
 Singanfu, inscription, ii. 385
 Singara in Eastern Mesopotamia, 166, 223
 Singidunum, 151
 Sinlessness of Christ, ii. 200, 224
 Siricius, pope, 468, 478, 510; on Jovinianism, 514, 515; on Ithacius, 515, 516: 526, 538; ii. 4, 26, 52, 123
 Sirmium, 193, 218; birthplace of Constantius, 219; council in year 351...219; in year 357...253; 266; five councils

enumerated, 267; Valens and Valentinian at, 354; 403, 462; creeds, ii. 409
 Sisinnius, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 238, 239, 254, 291, 357, 542
 —, a cleric, ii. 23
 —, Novatian bishop of Constantinople, 456, ii. 38, 239, 240
 Sixtus, pope, ii. 216, 217, 362, 373, 375, 412
 Smith, Dr. Payne, 165
 Smyrna, 16, 357, ii. 483
 Socrates, on Licinius, 41; encyclical of Alexander, 66; prejudice against Alexander, 67; on Constantine's letter, 69; on Constantine and Hosius, 70; letter of Eusebius to Cæsareans, 97; on Easter observance, 100, 101; Constantine's reply to Arius, 113; on Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis, 119; on Jerusalem, 120; on the true cross, 123; on the churches in Constantinople, 129; on the recall of Arian leaders, 136; on Eustathius, 138, 140; on mutual denunciations, 139; on the recall of Arius, 143; on the practice of magic, 147; on Marcellus, 158; on Alexander of Byzantium, 159, 161; on visits of St. Athanasius to Rome, 169; on the "consent" of the bishop of Rome, 177; on Eusebian envoys to Constans, 179; mistaken about Bishop Paul, 181; on the creed of Philippopolis, 184; on division between east and west, 191; on the threat of Constans, 196; on ordinations by St. Athanasius, 199; on Sirmian council, 219; on Macedonius, 222; on Pope Felix, 236; on Homoiousion, 248; on Eunomius, 252, 287; on the creed of Sirmium, 254; on Constantius and Ariminum, 270; on the creed of our fathers, 273; mistaken date of Nice, 274; on the labyrinth of Arian creeds, 281; on Meletius, 290; on the party of Euzoios, 293; on Julian and Gallus, 295; on Julian, 303, 309, 313; on Apollinaris, 314; a "golden sentence," 314; on the portent at Jerusalem, 317; on Hypostasis, 325; on Didymus, 338; on Jovian, 341; on Acacius, 342; on Lampsacus, 353; on Semi-Arians and Liberius, 357; on death of eighty ecclesiastics under Valens, 368; on Demophilus and Lucius, 418; on Flavian, 429; on Nectarius, 433; on Constantinopolitan canon, 438, 439; on Sisinnius, 456; on Theodosius, 458; on Bishop Leontius, 510; on uniformity, 522; on Novatian exemptions, 525; on Evagrius, 525; on Confession, 527; the destruction of the Serapeum, 531; on Sarapion, ii. 37; on St. Chrysostom and Sisinnius, 38; on Eutropius, 41; on the Tall Brothers, 56; on Theotimus, 64; on St. Chrysostom, 77; on fire and torture at Constantinople, 87; on Anthemius, 140; on St. Cyril, 190, 191; on Hypatia, 195; on Theodosius II.,

237; on Atticus, 238; on Philip of Side, 238; on penal laws, 254, 255; on Nestorius, 255, 256, 264; on St. Cyril at Ephesus, 313; on Maximian of Constantinople, 351; his history, 387; comments on his history and himself, 408, 409; 410, 411; on Maximin of Jerusalem, 517
 Soldiers, Christian, 311
 Solifidianism, ii. 174
 Solomon, ii. 206
 Son of God, Arian use of phrase, 74
 Song of Solomon, 477, 478; ii. 241
 Sophia, St., at Constantinople, 128, 222, 281; ii. 31, 39, 42, 140, 467
 Sophronas, an Alexandrian, ii. 274
 Sophronius of Paphlagonia, 270, 273, 281, 333, 341
 — of Tella, ii. 490
 Sotades, a poet of Crete, 64
 Soul, origin of the, ii. 180, 181
 Sozomen, on Licinius, 42; on Constantine's law about Friday, 48; on Eusebius of Nicomedia, 62; on the number of the Nicene bishops, 77; on pagan philosophers at Nicæa, 82; on the simplicity of the Nicene fathers, 83; on Eusebius at Nicæa, 85; on Easter, 101; on Alexander, 115; on the Holy Sepulchre, 120; on Antioch, 138; on St. Athanasius, 149; on Marcellus, 158; on the death of Arius, 160; on St. Antony, 161; on Alexander of Byzantium, 161; on Eusebian letter to Julius, 172; on the Dedication Creed, 175; on the "consent" of the bishop of Rome, 177; on Antiochene affairs, 197; on Persian affairs, 202, 203; on the death of Bishop Paul, 223; on attempt to decoy St. Athanasius, 224; on the council of Milan, 232; on Pope Felix, 236; on Homoousion, 248; on Liberius, 256, 261; on new Semi-Arian formula, 261; on Aetius, 280; on the result of Ariminum, 284; on Eunomius, 287; on heretical development, 289; on the sermon of Meletius, 292; on Julian, 303, 304, 306, 309, 311, 312, 340, 341; on Mark of Arethusa, 308; on the portent at Jerusalem, 317; on Didymus and Julian, 338; on Acacian letter to Jovian, 342; on Euzoios and Probatius, 345; on Valentinian, 352; on Lampsacus, 353; on Semi-Arians and Liberius, 357; on St. Ambrose and Gratian, 394; uses the word "dogma," 399; on the gentleness of Catholic bishops, 406; on Theodosius, 422, 458, 459; on the corpse of Meletius, 426, 427; on Flavian, 429; on Nectarius, 433; on Evagrius, 525; on confession, 527; on leniency to pagans, 530; on the destruction of the Serapeum, 531; on St. Chrysostom, ii. 31; a Macedonian story, 38; on Eutropius, 41; on hymns at Constantinople, 46; on anthropomorphic phrases, 53; on Isidore of Alexandria, 54, 56; on the synod of the

- Oak, 68; on the Tall Brothers, 72; on St. Chrysostom and Arcadius, 78; on Pope Innocent's letter to St. Chrysostom, 96; on Pulcheria, 236, 237; on sermons at Rome, 414
- Spain, bishops at Ariminum, 268; Visigoths in, 388; 395, 397, 422, 510; ii. 23, 120; relation to Rome, 121; 145, 299
- Sperantius, attendant on bishop Cæcilian at Arles, 28
- Splendor Paternæ gloriæ*, 492
- Spoletum, 226
- Spyridion, bishop of Tremithus, 79
- Stanton, Professor, ii. 397
- Stephen, bishop of Antioch, 139, 181, 185, 192, 193
- , bishop of Ephesus, ii. 429, 436, 479, 484, 487, 492, 524, 538
- , bishop of Germanicia, 405
- , bishop of Hierapolis, ii. 545
- , St., ii. 355; oratory of, 508
- Stephens, Dean, ii. 29, 32, 37
- Sticharia*, linen garments, 145
- Stilicho, ii. 2, 3, 13, 17, 23, 24, 92, 107, 118, 134, 136
- Stoic theory of sin, ii. 180
- Stokes, Professor, ii. 414
- Strangford Lough, ii. 417
- Strategius (Musonianus), 141
- Strategus, governor of Bithynia, ii. 513
- Strathclyde, ii. 415
- Stridon, 80
- Strong, T. B., dean of Christ Church, 93
- Studia Biblica, on the reading in an Ancyran canon, 35
- Subdeacons, 13, 208, ii. 135, 210
- Subintroductæ*, 213; ii. 37
- Subordinationism: Arian, 58, 67; of Donatus, 209; at Sirmium in 351...220; of Origenists, 541: and see Holy Spirit
- Suburbicarian churches, 105, 189, 396
- Succat, ii. 415
- Succensus (Successus), bishop of Diocæsarea, ii. 382, 383
- Succi, pass of, 191
- Suevi, 388; ii. 145, 179
- Suffecta, a place, ii. 24
- Suffragan bishops, 40, 78
- Sulpicius, Severus, 123, 268, 270, 275-277, 398, 401, 423, 463, 465, 468; ii. 20, 59
- Sunday, rest enforced by Constantine, 48
- Surrender, uncalled-for, disapproved, 16, 213
- Susanna, ii. 206
- Swearing, ii. 175
- Swete, Professor, ii. 162
- Syene, ii. 102
- Symeon Barsabæ, 203
- Stylites, St., ii. 243, 360
- Symmachus, 471, 510; ii. 120, 134
- Symphorianus, martyr, ii. 124
- Symphosius, a Priscillianist bishop, ii. 26
- Synaphæia*, ii. 259, 265
- Synecletius, a palace officer, 144
- Synesius, bishop, ii. 141-144, 194
- Synnada, ii. 95, 101, 141
- Synodicon*, ii. 387
- Synodites, ii. 550
- Synods, constituent members of, 174
- Syntagma*, a treatise by Asterius, 156
- Syracuse, 26, 27, 106
- Syria, 65, 67, 78, 101, 138, 176, 179, 308; ii. 94
- Syriac versions: epistle of Constantine, 76; list of Nicene bishops, 77; festal letters of Athanasius, 165; writings of Theodore, ii. 390, 436; acts of the Latrocinium, ii. 489; Syriac interpreter at trial of Ibas, ii. 441; study of Syriac at Edessa, ii. 355
- Syrianus, a duke, 239, 240; ii. 80, 409

T

- Tabenne (Tabennesus, near Tentyra), 134, 135, 540
- Tacitus, his phrase, "exitiabilis superstitio," 7
- Tagrit (Martyropolis), ii. 95, 145
- Tall Brothers, the, ii. 55-65, 69, 72
- Talleyrand, 21
- Tamugada, a place, ii. 21
- Tara, in Ireland, ii. 417
- Tarbula, a Persian martyr, 205
- Tarentum, 318, 470
- Tares, parable of the, ii. 151
- Tarragona, 28, 479; ii. 179
- Tarsus, 127, 251, 357, 359, 360, 374; ii. 88, 95, 355
- Tascodrogitæ*, 524
- Tatian, prefect, ii. 507
- Taurinus, a count, 210
- Taurobolia*, 300
- Taurus, Mount, 302, 359; ii. 90, 104
- , a prefect, 268, 274, 277
- Technical terms in theology defended, 89; inadequacy of, 68
- Te Deum*, the, ii. 394
- Teetotalers, 524
- Telemachus, monk, ii. 120
- Temples, heathen, ii. 24, 133. See Serapis
- Terebinthus, Mamre, 124
- Terentius, Bishop, 440
- Ternan, disciple of Palladius, ii. 235
- Tertullian, condemned postponement of baptism, 39; on Christian imperialism, 294; 213, ii. 173, 272, 399
- Thabraca, near Hippo, ii. 250, 251
- Thaddeus, 201
- Thagaste, 492; ii. 111, 115
- Thalassius, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, ii. 411, 479, 485, 487, 491, 492, 520
- , monk, ii. 268, 277
- , reader, ii. 239

Thalia of Arius, 64, 71, 91, 139, 409
 Thaumasius, Ammonius, ii. 194
 Theasius, an African bishop, ii. 114
 Theatrical performances disapproved at Arles, 29
 Thebaid, persecution in, 10; bishop of signed Tome of Antioch, 67; bishops at Nicæa, 78; Meletius in, 104; 105; monasticism in, 135; St. Athanasius in, 243; 322, 323, 375, 379; ii. 411
 Thebez, 405
 Thecla, ii. 69
 Themistius, a pagan orator, 347
 Theodore, bishop of Aquileia, 27
 —, bishop of Heraclea, 179, 219, 256
 —, bishop of Mopsuestia, ii. 95, 145, 161, 162; his Christology, 225; 241, 260-262, 331; influence in East, 355; 390, 393, 430, 431, 434-436, 441, 550
 —, bishop of Perinthus, 164
 —, priest of Genoa, ii. 400
 — the Reader, 77
 — the Sanctified, 243
 —, Tyre commissioner, 151
 —, a youth, 320
 Theodoret, on Arius, 55; letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre, 65; letter of Alexander to Philogonius, 68; quotes Eustathius of Antioch, 77; on number of Nicene bishops, 77; on Arianizing bishops, 80; on Eustathius and Constantine, 85; on Eustathius, 139, 140; on bishops at Antioch, 141; mistaken about Bishop Paul, 181; on Constantine and Liberius, 234; on Aetius, 251; on Eunomius, 286, 287; on Meletius, 290, 292; on Julian, 303, 309; on the portent at Jerusalem, 317; on the consecration of Paulinus, 329; on Lucifer, 331; on St. Basil, 373; on Flavian and Diodore, 374, 375; on baptism as a "seal," 376; on Gratian and Arians, 404; on Gratian and Meletius, 404; on Dolicha, 405; on Paulinus, 406, 407; on Theodosius and Meletius, 425; on translations, 430; on letter of Western bishops in year 382...451; on Theodosius, 455; on the Audians, 523; on the Antiochene schism, 525; on the Serapeum, 531; on St. Chrysostom, ii. 38; on the end of the Antiochene schism, 196; his episcopate, 242, 243; on Persia, 245; on Cyril's anathemas, 309; at Ephesus, 326; use of word "temple," 338; in Oriental deputation, 344; on the Oriental deputation, 348; sermon at departure, 352; 353; relation to Nestorianizers in Constantinople, 358; mentions five Nestorianizing bishops, 359; St. Cyril's language, 365; attitude at the Re-union, 375, 376; 382; condemned Nestorius, 390, 411, 412; 407, 408; on reception of the body of St. Chrysostom, 410; forged letters ascribed

to him, 426, 427; 428-430; Dialogues, 432, 433; 458; opposition to, 436-440; works, 438; confined to diocese, 445; in correspondence with Flavian, 462; anxious about Eutychianism, 466, 467; 471; on Latrocinium, 486; his case at Latrocinium, 490, 491; his letter to St. Leo, 498-500; letter to Romulus, 505; admitted to Chalcedon, 517; anathematized "two sons," 519; quoting St. Cyril's Scholia, 522; declaration of faith at Chalcedon, 525; anathematized Nestorius, 535, 537; 545, 550
 Theodorice, 127, 232, 388
 Theodorus, correspondent of St. Augustine, ii. 110
 Theodosian, a Palestinian Christian, 10
 Theodosian, Code, 105; walls at Constantinople, ii. 81
 Theodosius I., 288, 331, 349; elevation of, 407; opening of his reign, 408; baptized, 415; edicts, 415, 422; letter to North Italian bishops, 453; Eastern bishops in year 383...455; Amphilochius, 459; laws against heretics, 459, 524, 525; Novatians exempted, 525, ii. 191; befriended Valentinian and Justina, 502; defeated Maximus, 508; at Milan, 516; massacre at Thessalonica, 516-519; his last years, 520; laws against pagans, 532, 533; death, 543; ii. 21; law against heretics, 114; and Jews, 191, 192; 195; his forum, 334
 — II., 534; ii. 64, 134, 140, 191, 236; his character, 237; and Persia, 245; 254; and the council of Ephesus, 334; the Orientals, 355; Celestine, 357; St. Cyril, 360, 393; Proclus, 386; Nestorius, 387; godson of St. Chrysostom, 410; letter from Domnus, 434; Theodoret, 438, 439, 471; Ibas, 444; 448; Eutyches, 466, 467; Flavian, 494; St. Leo, 495, 496; 502, 503; death, 504; recognised Bassian, 538; 542
 —, bishop of Philadelphia, 342
 —, bishop of Synada, ii. 141
 —, bishop of Tripolis, 139, 181
 —, priest, ii. 462
 Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, ii. 241, 313, 314, 319, 325, 343, 354
 —, bishop of Antioch, ii. 241, 243, 437
 —, bishop of Hierapolis, 405
 —, bishop of Laodicea, 65, 67, 199
 —, bishop of Nicopolis, 390
 —, bishop of Oxyrinchos, 242
 —, an envoy, ii. 391
 —, heretic, ii. 266
 Theodulus, a Christian in Antioch, 309
 —, a martyr in Phrygia, 311
 —, bishop of Trajanople, 191
 Theogenes, bishop of Carthage, ii. 5
 Theognis, bishop of Nicea, 79, 81, 97, 119, 136, 137, 139, 151, 154, 184

- Theonas, an adherent of Arius, 61, 97
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 56, 116
 Theopathy, ii. 383
 Theopemptus, a bishop, ii. 296
 —, another bishop, ii. 335
 —, bishop of Cabasa, ii. 488
 —, Novatian bishop, ii. 191
 Theophanes, chronicler, ii. 488, 489
 Theophanius (Theophanes), bishop of Philadelphia, ii. 241
 Theophilus of Alexandria, 526, 528, 531; ii. 4, 29, 39, 45, 46; and Origenism, 49–63; change in view, 52, 53; anti-Origenist, 54; Tall Brothers, 56, 57; letters to Jerome, 58, 59; journey to Constantinople, 65; proceedings at the Oak, 66–68, 71; departure 75; 93, 98; closing days, 141; death, 144; lesson of his episcopate, 190; 263, 372, 533
 — of Castabala, 357, 360
 —, bishop of the Goths, 79
 —, a deacon, ii. 536
 —, the Indian, 243, 262, 342
 —, a priest, ii. 88
 —, another priest, ii. 451, 452
 Theophoros, 383; not used by Basil, ii. 309
 Theophrastus, Bishop, 175, 179
 —, disciple of Eunomius, 521; ii. 239
 Theotecnus, a persecutor at Antioch, 9
 —, bishop of Cæsarea, ii. 9
 Theotimus, bishop of Tomi, ii. 63
 Theotokos, 68, 447; ii. 257, 262; early use, 263; admitted by John of Antioch, 352; 264, 267, 272, 277, 285, 310, 354, 376, 394, 467, 528, 529, 531
 Thessalonica, death of Licinius at, 45; Bishop Alexander, 79; Bishop Paul, 161; bishop at Sardica, 181; disorders at, 188; 414–416, 502, 516–519; Vicariate for Rome in Eastern Illyricum, 407, 454, ii. 96, 98, 205, 222, 313
 Thmuis, 171, 224
 Thoas, ii. 144
 Thomas, St., 201; ii. 39, 269
 Thomist formula on grace, ii. 228
 Thrace, represented at Nicæa, 78; province of, 107; Eustathius banished to, 140; represented at Jerusalem, 153; Arian outrages, 176; 179, 191, 235, 375; ii. 27, 240; custom as to bishoprics, ii. 332
 Three Chapters, the, ii. 537
 Tiber, 362; ii. 137
 Tiberianus, 468
 Tiberias, 134; Jewish patriarch at, ii. 192
 Tibur, 201, 362
 Tigrisum, 14
 Tigris, ii. 385
 Tigris, presbyter, ii. 68, 88
 Tillemont, on Marcus, 20; on Licinius, 42; on date of Alexandrian synod against Arius, 60; on Constantine's letter, 68; on visit of Hosius, 70; on St. Athanasius, 116, 323; on burial of St. Helena, 124; on first conventual community, 131; on palinode of Eusebius and Theognis, 137; on Constantine's letter recalling Arius, 143; on letter of Julius to Eusebians, 177; on Donatists, 208, 211; on date affecting Ethiopia, 216; on Pope Felix, 237; on Hosius, 255; on Eudoxius 257; on St. Hilary's work on the Councils, 266; on Arianizers at Ariminum, 275, 276; on the results of Ariminum, 284; on Liberius, 262, 285; on Lucifer, 329; on pomp, 364; on council of year 371... 381; on Roman synod of year 376... 387; on Phœbadius and Servatius, 398; on St. Martin and the prince in Gaul, 399; on Eusebius of Samosata, 405; leaves a difficult phrase unexplained, 410; on Theodosius, 422; on Nectarius, 433, 527; on letter of council of Constantinople in year 382... 453; on St. Martin, 466; on St. Augustine, ii. 22, 306, 307; on St. Chrysostom, 29, 30, 38, 63; 80, 84; on successors of St. Gregory and St. Chrysostom, 88; on death of Eudoxia, 95; on Pelagius, 161; on the synod of Diospolis, 189; on patriarchal jurisdiction, 197; on Alexander of Antioch, 198; on Isidore of Pelusium, 244; 277, 278; on presidency at Ephesus, 318; on the subsequent "tempest," 325; 326, 347; his austerity, 372; on the criticisms of Cyril's articles, 384; on St. Vincent's Commonitory, 399; on sermons at Rome, 414; on Hilary's position as bishop of Arles, 420; on Eutyches, 434; on Theodoret, 438; on Flavian, 470, 489; on Barsumas, 471; on St. Leo's Tome, 475; on Roman legates at Latrocinium, 479, 484, 485; on Domnus, 492; on Dioscuros, 494, 512
 Timasius, general, ii. 41
 —, master of soldiery, 509
 —, Pelagian, ii. 175
 Timotheus, disciple of Apollinaris, 387, 521
 Timothy, archdeacon of Alexandria, ii. 190
 —, bishop of Alexandria, 416, 424, 425, 429, 440, 445
 —, Arian, ii. 140
 —, St., ii. 67, 93, 127, 399, 539
 Tipara, 335
 Titus, St., ii. 67
 Todd, Dr., ii. 418
 Tokat (Comana), in Pontus, ii. 105
 Toledo, councils of, ii. 25, 116
 Toleration of Christianity, chap. i. p. 1
 Tome of Alexander, 67; of Alexandria, 328; of Constantinople, 433; of the Westerns, 453; of St. Proclus, ii. 390; of St. Leo, ii. 465, 472–475, 520, 522, 525, 526, 532
 Tomi, a place, ii. 63
 Tongres, 217, 224
 Torcello, near Venice, 126

Torture as punishment, ii. 194
 Totila, 388; ii. 138
 Toulouse, 239; ii. 125
 Tours, 398, 401; ii. 19, 20
 Toxotius, 481
 Tracheotis Seleucia, 266
Tractoria, a circular, ii. 212, 505
 Traditors, 14, 29, 209, 212; ii. 148
 Traducianism, ii. 180
 Tragedy, the, of Irenæus, a narrative, ii. 387, 388, 430
 Trajan, ii. 193
 Trajanople, 191
 Translation of Bible by St. Jerome, ii. 129
 — of clerics, 29, 107, 108, 141, 429, ii. 386, 533
 Trappists, 524
 Tre Fontane, 127
 Tremithus, in Cyprus, 79
 Trench, archbishop, 299
 Trent, 442; ii. 23
 Treves (Trier), favourite city of Constantine, 20; 27; first exile of St. Athanasius, 154; history of, 155, 165; 181, 395, 400, 402, 462, 465, 498, 501
 Tribigild, an Ostrogoth, ii. 41, 42
 Trinity, the Holy, Pelagius on, ii. 161
 Tripolis, 139; ii. 111
 Tritheism, 91
 Troas, ii. 102
 Troica, a mountain in Egypt, 131
 Trophimus, alleged first missionary to Arles, 27
 Troubles of the Church summarized, 11
 Trygetius, 499
 Tubursica, conference at, ii. 21
 Turin, council at, ii. 124
 Turner, Mr. C. H., 77
 Two Graves, street in Armagh, ii. 418
 Tyana, 359, 390, 391
 Tyrannus, a pagan priest, 531
 Tyre, cathedral at, 9; Bishop Zeno, 62; Bishop Paulinus, 78, 141; trial of St. Athanasius, 149–153; 156, 157, 165; birthplace of Ædesius and Frumentius, 215; case of Ibas at, ii. 443, 536

U

Ulfilas, Ulphilas, Urphilas, 79, 280, 387, 421, 441, 521; ii. 40
 Umbria, 267
 Unilas, bishop, ii. 94
 Unworthiness of minister in sacraments, ii. 113, 135, 151
 Urbanus of Himeria, ii. 441, 443, 488, 490
 —, bishop of Tyre, 258, 270, 274
 Urbanus, bishop, ii. 248
 —, an ecclesiastic, 367
 Urbicus, deacon of Athanasius, 255
 Ursacius of Singidunum, 151, 154, 185,

195, 200, 217, 219, 224, 253, 268, 274, 341, 352, 365, 399
 Ursicinus, Ursinus, 362, 364, 395, 444
 Ursus, financial minister, 8
 Usthazanes, 203
 Usury, disapproved at Arles, 29
 Utica, 24
 Uzala, town, ii. 227

V

Vaga, ii. 14
 Valacius, a soldier in Egypt, 171
 Valarshabad, 112
 Valence, council in year 374...398
 Valens, Emperor, 312; character, 349; persecuted Catholics, 355, 367, 371; baptized, 360; his son, 374; on Egyptian monks, 376; immigration of Goths, 387; ii. 56, 78, 244
 — of Mursa, 151, 154, 185, 195, 200, 217, 219, 224, 228, 229, 253, 266, 268, 274, 276, 277, 341, 352, 365, 399, 458
 —, another Arian, 444
 Valentinian I., 312; his character, 348; at Milan in 364...350; his greed, 361; on causes of prelates, 364; his letter in year 375...382; death, 383; consulted on vacancy at Milan, 385; his son Gratian, 394; St. Martin and, 400, 401; ii. 408
 — II., 127, 395, 462, 473, 475, 502, 533, 535, 536; ii. 137
 — III., ii. 246, 420, 448, 500, 501
 Valentinians, 508
 Valentinus, an abbot, ii. 227
 —, a bishop, ii. 118
 —, a count, ii. 93
 — the Gnostic, 56, 68, 91, 524; ii. 432, 460, 481
 —, a layman, ii. 95
 Valerian, bishop of Aquileia, 382, 397, 442, 451
 —, bishop of Iconium, ii. 382
 —, Emperor, 3, 131, 147
 Valerius, bishop of Hippo, ii. 4, 13
 —, chamberlain, ii. 286
 —, count, ii. 222
 Valesius, 20, 191, 216, 407
 Vallagas, priest, ii. 96
 Vandals, 388; ii. 125, 145, 179; siege of Hippo, 304; 351, 403, 407
 Van Millingen, Professor, 128, 130
 Varanes (Vararam), ii. 245
 Vatican, hill at Rome, 126, 208; the, ii. 137
 Venerius, bishop of Marseilles, ii. 401
 —, bishop of Milan, ii. 82, 98, 107
 Veneti, people of Aquileia, 195
 Venice, 126
Veni, Redemptor gentium, 518, ii. 288, 356
 Vercellæ, 226, 285
 Verecundus, 499

Verinian, bishop of Perga, ii. 343
 Verona, 54, 181, 225
 Versicle and response, ii. 74
 Verus, bishop of Vienne, 27
 —, vice-prefect, 23
 Vestments, Eucharistic, ii. 70
 Vesulas, deacon, ii. 313
 Vetrano, 219
 Vettius, Prætextatus, 471
Vetus, Latin version of Nicene Canons so called, 105
Via Cornelia, 126; *Sacra* at Rome, 470
 Vicarius, 396
 — urbis, 105
 Victor, an Alexandrian, ii. 274
 —, abbot at Constantinople, ii. 311
 —, Count, 462
 — of Garbia, 208
 —, Pope, 100
 —, St., at Milan, 483; abbey of, ii. 247
 — of Vita, ii. 403, 406, 407
 Victorius from Ireland, ii. 416
 Victorinus, Bishop, ii. 110, 111
 —, an officer, 355
 —, a professor, 498
 Victricius of Rouen, 539, ii. 122, 124, 125
 Victory, altar of, 470, 471, 510, 536, 537
 Vienne, 27, 302, 536, 537; ii. 124, 419, 420
 Vigilantius, controversy with St. Jerome, ii. 125–129
 Vigilus, bishop of Trent, 538
 —, Pope, ii. 537
 Vigils, ii. 126–128
 Viminacium, 164
 Viminal, 126
 Vincennalia, 110
 Vincent, bishop of Capua, papal envoy at Nicæa, 80, 81, 176, 192, 225, 285
 —, deacon of Saragossa, 11
 — of Lerins, ii. 247, 396, 398, 400
 Virgil, 492, 500; ii. 16
 Virgilius of Arles, 27
 Virgins, 60, 308, 335, ii. 110, 122, 177
 Virius Flavianus, 471
 Visigoths, 388, 503; ii. 179
 Vitalis, bishop of Antioch, 34
 —, Apollinarian bishop, 386, 521
 —, bishop of Bologna, 11
 —, bishop of Carthage, ii. 230
 —, a Spaniard, ii. 395
 Vito, a priest, papal envoy at Nicæa, 28, 80, 81, 176
 Vitricius, bishop of Rouen, 539
 Vocius, bishop of Lyons, 27
 Volusianus, an inquirer, ii. 156
 Volventius, proconsul, 463
 Vulgate, 11, 541

W

Wace, Dr., 74, 75, 93, 94
 Walls of Theodosius II., ii. 236
 War, St. Augustine on, ii. 156
 Waterland, 71, 87; ii. 381
 Watchwords of Catholics and Donatists, 211
 Watson, Mr., on St. Hilary, 238
 Wednesday, observance of, 242; ii. 6; a storm on, ii. 40
 Wesley, ii. 38, 400
 Westcott, late bishop of Durham, 12
 Western Christians, 11, 78; Western Church to end of fourth century, 1; Western affairs to the taking of Rome, 107; Western and Eastern affairs to A.D. 445...395
 Whitby, 481
 Whitefield, ii. 400
 Whitsunday, 162, ii. 147, 246, 312
 Wicklow, ii. 235
 Widows, 170
 Wilfrid, St., ii. 100
 Willis, Professor, 123
 Wilson, Bishop, 108
 Wisdom, book of, ii. 130
 Witchcraft, 47, 480
 Women and clergy, 213
 Worldly minded clergymen, 479

X

Xantippus of Tagosa, ii. 111
 Xenocharis, a philosopher, ii. 123

Y

Yazdejerd, King of Persia, ii. 245
 York, 2, 28, 127; ii. 197
 Yorkshire dedications to St. Helena, 124

Z

Zama, 13
 Zeno, a bishop in Cyprus, ii. 331
 —, bishop of Tyre, 62
 —, a commander, ii. 437
 —, a consul, ii. 443
 Zenophilus, 15, 206
 Zeugma, 378; ii. 377
 Zeuxippus, Zeus, 128, 129, 222, 318, 529; ii. 86
 Zonaras, 439
 Zosimus, historian, 416, 507, 538; ii. 29
 — of Naples, 331
 —, Pope, 27; ii. 186, 204–206, 208–215; on Pelagianism, 211, 220, 330; letter to Ravenna, 222; case of Apiarius, 248; 419

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

114065

Bright, William

The age of the Fathers
v. II

270.29

B76

v.2 c.4

114065

270.29

B76

v.2 c.4

